



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Cost price \$1.55 — 1915

200




BS

2407

.S66 .

1884



San Francisco

ONLY
OF
MICH.

THE STUDENT'S SCRIPTURE HISTORY.

THE
NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY

WITH
AN INTRODUCTION, CONNECTING THE HISTORY OF THE
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

EDITED
BY ^{Rev} WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D.,
CLASSICAL EXAMINER IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.



WITH MAPS AND WOODCUTS.

NEW YORK:
HARPER & BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS,
FRANKLIN SQUARE.
1884.

THE STUDENT'S SERIES.

12MO, CLOTH, UNIFORM IN STYLE.

MANUAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. By PHILIP SMITH. Illustrated. \$1 50.	HISTORY OF FRANCE. By the Rev. W. H. JARVIS, M.A. Illustrated. \$1 25.
THE STUDENT'S CLASSICAL DICTIONARY. Illustrated. \$1 25.	HUME'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. Illustrated. New Edition. \$1 50.
ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE EAST. By PHILIP SMITH. Illustrated. \$1 25.	STRICKLAND'S QUEENS OF ENGLAND. Illustrated. \$1 25.
HISTORY OF GREECE. By Dr. WILLIAM SMITH. Illustrated. \$1 25.	HALLAM'S CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND. \$1 25.
COX'S GENERAL HISTORY OF GREECE. With Maps. \$1 25.	HALLAM'S MIDDLE AGES. \$1 25.
LIDDELL'S HISTORY OF ROME. Illustrated. \$1 25.	OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. By PHILIP SMITH. With Maps and Illustrations. \$1 25.
MERIVALE'S GENERAL HISTORY OF ROME. With Maps. \$1 25.	NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY. By PHILIP SMITH. With Maps and Illustrations. \$1 25.
GIBBON'S DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. Illustrated. \$1 25.	LEWIS'S HISTORY OF GERMANY. With Maps and Illustrations. \$1 50.
LYELL'S GEOLOGY. Illustrated. \$1 25.	

THE STUDENT'S SMALLER SERIES.

16MO, CLOTH.

SCRIPTURE HISTORY. 60 cents.	HISTORY OF ENGLAND. 60 cents.
HISTORY OF GREECE. 60 cents.	ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE EAST. 60 cts.
HISTORY OF ROME. 60 cents.	SEEMANN'S MYTHOLOGY. 60 cents.
COX'S SCHOOL HISTORY OF GREECE. 60 cents.	MERIVALE'S SCHOOL HISTORY OF ROME. 75 cents.

PUBLISHED BY HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Any of the above books sent by mail, postage prepaid, to any part of the United States, on receipt of the price.

Gift
Mrs. J. H. Davis
1-4-27

PREFACE.

THE object of this Work is the same as that of the Old Testament History, namely, to supply a Manual of New Testament History, which in fullness, accuracy, and use of the best sources of information, may take its place by the side of the Histories of Greece, Rome, England, and France, in the present series.

The Work consists of three parts. The First Book gives the connection between Old and New Testament History, including the relations of the Holy Land to Persia, Egypt, and Syria, and the narrative sets forth the main facts of the general history of the East during what is called the "Hellenistic" age. To preserve the unity of the subject, this part is brought down to the destruction of Jerusalem. The Appendix contains a full account of the national and religious life of each separate section of the Jewish nation—of the Dispersion as well as in Judæa—their Scriptures, worship, and sects; in short, that information respecting them which is necessary to understand the condition of the people at the advent of our Saviour, and the allusions in the Gospels.

The Second Book, containing the Gospel History, is designed to present a clear, harmonized account of our Lord's Ministry, as related by the Four Evangelists, illustrated by all needful collateral information, but free from speculative discussions. Pains have been taken to exhibit

09-26-32 HWD

the different chronological views of the highest authorities; and the Appendix contains a discussion of the great question respecting the origin of the Gospels, and a Table of the Gospel Harmony.

The Third Book, embracing the Apostolic History, aims at a completeness not previously attained in any similar work. The method, in which Paley led the way, of using the Epistles of St. Paul, not only to supply the incidents omitted in the Acts, but to set the Apostle's spirit and character in a vivid light, has been followed throughout. Similar use is made of the Epistles of Peter, John, and James, and the section is completed by a summary of all that is really known, both of the other Apostles and of the persons associated with them in the History. The unity of this part is preserved by bringing it down to the destruction of Jerusalem; and that catastrophe which closes the first book as an historic event, is now exhibited, in the light of our Lord's great prophecy, as the epoch of his coming in the full establishment of the Christian Church.

The History embodies much valuable matter from the Dictionary of the Bible, and in particular from the Archbishop of York's articles on the life of our Saviour and on the Gospels, as well as from the different articles on the Apostles and the books of the New Testament and Apocrypha.

The appearance of Mr. Lewin's "*Fasti Sacri*" has aided the Editor in giving the work that chronological completeness which will be especially seen in the Tables.

WM. SMITH.

LONDON, *November*, 1866.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT HISTORIES,
AND SECULAR HISTORY OF THE JEWS TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM. B.C. 400-A.D. 70.

	CHAP.	PAGE
B.C. 400-168.	I. FROM NEHEMIAH TO THE PERSECUTION OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.....	13
	<i>Notes and Illustrations:</i>	
	Kings of the Greek Kingdom of Syria.....	32
B.C. 168-106.	II. THE MACCABEAN WAR OF INDEPENDENCE.....	33
	<i>Notes and Illustrations:</i>	
	(A.) The Asmonæan Family.....	59
	(B.) Modin and the Sepulchre of the Maccabees	59
B.C. 106-37.	III. THE ASMONÆAN KINGDOMS.....	61
	<i>Notes and Illustrations:</i>	
	(A.) The Sanhedrim.....	73
	(B.) Pedigree of the Herodian Family.....	75
B.C. 37-4.	IV. HEROD THE GREAT.....	76
	<i>Notes and Illustrations:</i>	
	(A.) The Herodians.....	93
	(B.) Temple of Herod.....	94
B.C. 4-A.D. 70.	V. SECULAR HISTORY OF THE JEWS, FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.....	97
	<i>Notes and Illustrations:</i>	
	Governors of Syria.....	139

APPENDIX TO BOOK I.

SECT.		
I.	The Several Branches of the Jewish People.....	140
II.	The Jewish Scriptures.....	151
III.	New Forms of Worship—The Synagogues.....	159
IV.	Sects of the Jews.....	164

BOOK II.

THE HISTORY OF JESUS CHRIST; OR, THE REVELATION
OF THE GOSPEL.

	CHAP.	PAGE
B.C. 5-A.D. 26.	VI. BIRTH AND EARLY LIFE OF JOHN AND JESUS.....	177
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	(A.) Genealogy of Jesus Christ.....	192
	(B.) Date of the Birth of Jesus Christ.....	194
	(C.) Cyrenius and the Census.....	195
	(D.) Bethlehem.....	195
	(E.) Nazareth.....	196
A.D. 26-27.	VII. OUR SAVIOUR'S EARLY MINISTRY. FROM THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST TO CHRIST'S FIRST PASSEVER.....	198
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	(A.) The Publicans.....	215
	(B.) Place of our Lord's Baptism.....	216
A.D. 27-28.	VIII. FIRST YEAR OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY. FROM HIS FIRST PASSEVER TO HIS SECOND VISIT TO JERUSALEM, PROBABLY AT THE PASSEVER.....	218
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	(A.) Scene of our Lord's Ministry.....	248
	(B.) Duration of our Lord's Ministry.....	249
	(C.) Galilee.....	251
A.D. 28-29.	IX. THE SEQUEL OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY IN GALILEE, FROM AFTER HIS SECOND PASSEVER, IN A.D. 28, TO NEAR THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES, A.D. 29.	252
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	(A.) The Brethren of the Lord.....	281
	(B.) The Parables of Christ.....	283
	(C.) The Scene of the Transfiguration.....	286
A.D. 29-30.	X. THE LAST SIX MONTHS OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY. FROM THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES, A.D. 29, TO HIS FOURTH PASSEVER, A.D. 30.....	288
A.D. 30.	XI. THE PASSION OF OUR LORD. FROM PALM SUNDAY TO EASTER EVE, APRIL 1ST TO APRIL 7TH, A.D. 30	302
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	(A.) The Mount of Olives.....	337
	(B.) The Paschal Supper.....	341
	(C.) Crucifixion.....	344
	(D.) The Site of the Holy Sepulchre.... ..	345

	CHAP.	PAGE
A.D. 30.	XII. THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION OF CHRIST. FROM EASTER DAY TO ASCENSION DAY, APRIL 8TH TO MAY 17TH, A.D. 30.....	347
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	Mr. Lewin's Scheme of the Chronology of our Lord's Life.....	358

APPENDIX TO BOOK II.

The Four Gospels.....	360
Table of the Harmony of the Four Gospels.....	373

BOOK III.

HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES; OR, THE FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

A.D. 30-37.	XIII. THE CHURCH IN PALESTINE TO THE DISPERSION OF THE CHRISTIANS FROM JERUSALEM.....	377
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	Simon Magus.....	399
A.D. 37-40.	XIV. CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL.....	401
	Table of St. Paul's Life.....	424
A.D. 40-48 } or 50. }	XV. FROM AFTER THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL TO THE DECREE OF THE FIRST COUNCIL AT JERUSA- LEM, INCLUDING THE FIRST MISSIONARY JOUR- NEY OF PAUL AND BARNABAS.....	423
A.D. 49 or } 51-53 or 54 }	XVI. ST. PAUL'S SECOND, OR GREAT MISSIONARY JOUR- NEY, AND THE ENTRANCE OF THE GOSPEL INTO EUROPE.....	457
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	(A.) The Visit of Galatians II.....	495
	(B.) Thessalonica.....	497
A.D. 54-60.	XVII. ST. PAUL'S THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY; HIS ARREST AT JERUSALEM, AND IMPRISONMENT AT CÆSAREA.....	499
A.D. 60-63.	XVIII. ST. PAUL'S FIRST IMPRISONMENT AT ROME. FROM HIS HEARING BEFORE FESTUS TO HIS RELEASE	552
	<i>Notes and Illustrations :</i>	
	(A.) Laodicea.....	602
	(B.) The Epistle to the Ephesians, and the Lao- diccan Epistle mentioned in Col. iv. 16.....	602

	CHAP.	PAGE
A.D. 63-70.	XIX. THE LAST DAYS OF ST. PAUL AND ST. PETER; AND THE COMPLETE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH. FROM THE RELEASE OF ST. PAUL TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.....	607
	<i>Notes and Illustrations:</i>	
	(A.) Hymenæus and his Heresy.....	651
	(B.) Authorities for the Life of St. Paul.....	652
A.D. 70 and onward. }	XX. SUPPLEMENTAL HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS, AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM	654

APPENDIX I.

THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

I. The Five Historical Books.....	700
II. The Fourteen Epistles of Paul.....	711
III. The Seven Catholic or General Epistles.....	718
IV. The Revelation of St. John.....	719

APPENDIX II.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES OF NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY, IN-
CLUDING THE CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTA-
MENTS.

I. The Persian Domination.....	725
II. The Hellenistic Domination.....	727
III. The Maccabees and Asmonæan Kings.....	729
IV. Kingdom of Herod the Great, subject to and under the protec- tion of Rome.....	734
V. The Roman Domination—Part I. The Gospel History.....	741
VI. “ “ “ Part II. The Apostolic History....	748
INDEX.....	757

GENEALOGICAL TABLES.

The Asmonæan Family.....	59
Pedigree of the Herodian Family.....	75
The Family of Herod the Great	99

LIST OF MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

SEPARATE MAPS.

	PAGE
HISTORICAL MAPS.....	<i>To face page</i> 93
1. The Holy Land under the Maccabees and Herod the Great.	
2. The Holy Land under the sons of Herod the Great.	
3. The Holy Land, showing the kingdom of Agrippa I.	
4. Roman province of Judæa and the kingdom of Agrippa II.	
The Holy Land, to illustrate the New Testament.....	257
St. Paul's First and Second Missionary Journeys.....	454
St. Paul's Third Missionary Journey.....	511
A Chart of St. Paul's Voyage to Rome.....	568

MAPS INSERTED IN THE TEXT.

Plan of Jerusalem.....	117
Map of Galilee.....	240
Plan of Athens	477
Chart of part of the Coast of Malta.....	573

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Jerusalem	<i>Frontispiece</i>
Candlestick of the Temple.....	<i>Title Page</i>
View of the Lake of Antioch.....	13
Coin of Antiochus Epiphanes.....	33
Silver Coin of the Maccabees.....	58
Coin of Antiochus VI.....	61
Temple of Herod restored.....	76
Capital of Pillar in Vestibule of the Southern Entrance of Herod's Temple	96
Remains of Arch of Bridge of the Temple.....	97
Bethlehem.....	177
Nazareth.....	198
Sea of Galilee.....	218
Sidon.....	252

	PAGE
Bethany	288
Gethsemane.....	302
Mount of Olives.....	347
Jerusalem.....	377
Tarsus.....	401
Antioch.....	425
Thessalonica	457
Ruins of the Theatre at Ephesus.....	499
Greek Imperial Coin of Ephesus and Smyrna allied.....	518
Greek Imperial Copper Coin ("medallion") of Laodicea of Phrygia...	521
Cæsarea	552
Ancient Ship.....	601
Stairs of the modern Capitol at Rome.....	607
Colossæ	654

1.
 2. 76. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20.
 3. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30.
 4. 167-63 E.

Eliashib, the high-priest in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, was succeeded by his son JOIADA,² and he by his son JONATHAN or JOHANAN (John), down to whose time the heads of the tribe of Levi were entered in the Chronicles of Judah, which seem therefore to have ended with his priesthood.³

The high-priesthood of Jonathan, which lasted thirty-two years, chiefly in the long reign of Artaxerxes II. Mnemon (B.C. 405–359), was stained by the first of those acts of murderous rivalry, which afterward brought the state to anarchy. His brother, Joshua (Jesus), who was suspected of aiming at the high-priesthood by the favor of Bagoses the Persian satrap, was slain by Jonathan in the temple. The satrap punished the murder by a tax of fifty shekels on every lamb offered in sacrifice, and polluted the temple by his presence.⁴ But even in so doing, the Persian taught the Jews the much-needed lesson afterward enforced by a far higher authority: "Am not I purer," he said, "than the dead body of him whom ye have slain in the temple?"

This crime forms the only memorable event in the annals of Judæa, from the government of Nehemiah to the Macedonian conquest, if we except a doubtful account that the country was chastised, and a number of Jews carried captive to Babylon, for their alleged participation in the revolt of the Sidonians under Artaxerxes Ochus (B.C. 351).

§ 3. JADDUA, the son and successor of Jonathan, is the last of the high-priests mentioned in the Old Testament; and his is the latest name in the Old Testament, with the doubtful exception of a few in the genealogies prefixed to the Chronicles. Its insertion in the Book of Nehemiah is a guide to the time when the Canon of the Old Testament was finally closed.⁵

Eusebius assigns twenty years to the pontificate of Jaddua, who was high-priest both under Darius Codomannus (B.C. 336–331) and after the fall of the Persian empire. Josephus tells a romantic story of an interview between Jaddua and

² Neh. xii. 10, xiii. 28. The title "the high-priest," in the second passage, may refer either to Eliashib or Joiada; if to the latter, he became high-priest in the time of Nehemiah. It was one of his sons that married the daughter of Sanballat the Horonite (*Old Testament Hist.* ch. xxvi). A complete list of the high-priests and the contemporary civil rulers is given in the *Old Testament History*,

Appendix to Book III., § 4, notes, etc.

³ Neh. xii. 11, 22, 23. "The sons of Levi, the chief of the fathers, were written in the book of the Chronicles, even unto the days of Johanan, the son of Eliashib."

⁴ About B.C. 366. Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 7, § 1.

⁵ Neh. xii. 11, 22. "The Levites, in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, Jo-

Alexander the Great.⁶ While Alexander was besieging Tyre, he sent to demand the submission of the Jews, who answered that they were the faithful vassals of Darius (B.C. 332.) After taking Gaza, Alexander marched against Jerusalem. Jaddua, by the command of God in a vision, hung the city with garlands, and went forth in solemn procession to meet the conqueror at Sapha (the *watch*), an eminence in full sight of the city and the temple. On seeing the high-priest in his state robes, the priests in their sacred dresses, and the people clothed in white, Alexander fell prostrate in adoration, and rising, embraced the high-priest. To the remonstrances of Parmenio he replied that he worshiped, not the priest, but the NAME engraved upon his frontlet, and that he recognized in him a figure that had appeared to him in a vision in Macedonia, and bidden him to conquer Persia. Entering Jerusalem, he offered sacrifice, and was shown the prophecies of Daniel relating to himself. He granted the Jews, not only in Judæa, but also in Media and Babylonia, the free enjoyment of their own laws, and exemption from tribute during the Sabbatic year.⁷ The story is discredited by the best critics, on account of its internal improbabilities, approaching to contradictions, and the silence of the historians of Alexander.⁸ The statement of Justin,⁹ that on Alexander's advance into Syria he was met by many Eastern princes with their diadems, affords some confirmation to the story of the high-priest's coming out to meet him in person. It is certain that Jerusalem and Judæa submitted to the conqueror, and there are traces subsequently of the privileges he is said to have granted to the Jews. Alexander's homage to Jehovah, and his pleasure at being named as the instrument of destiny, are points thoroughly consistent with his character. There is nothing improbable in his having received the submission of Judæa from the high-priest and princes about the time of the siege of Gaza.

hanan, and Jaddua, were recorded chief of the fathers; also the priests, to the reign of Darius *the Persian*," where the epithet has been thought to suggest that the passage was written after the fall of the Persian empire. If, as is now generally admitted, the passage in 1 Chr. iii. 22-24 is spurious, the name of Jaddua is the last mentioned in the Old Testament Canon.

⁶ Respecting the apostasy of Ma-

nasseh, whom Josephus places in the time of Darius and Alexander, and makes the first priest of the schismatic temple on Mount Gerizim, see *Old Testament History*, chap. xxvii. § 10.

⁷ Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 8, the Talmud, and later Jewish writers.

⁸ Arrian (iii. 1) expressly says that Alexander marched from Gaza to Pelusium in seven days.

⁹ *Hist.* xi. 10.

At all events, Jerusalem was too important to have been passed over by Alexander himself, as it is by the historians.¹⁰ He enlisted Jewish soldiers, and removed a large number of Jews to Egypt, to aid in peopling his new city of Alexandria.¹¹

The Samaritans are said to have claimed the same privileges as the Jews, which Alexander refused to grant. Hence probably arose the rebellion in which they murdered the Macedonian governor, Andromachus, and which Alexander punished by the destruction of Samaria.¹² Palestine thenceforth remained quiet under Alexander, who died in B.C. 323.

The Macedonian conqueror must not, however, be dismissed without some further notice of his real place in Jewish history, and in the sacred history of the world—a place not dependent on any incidental circumstances, such as his visit to Jerusalem.

In the prophetic visions of Daniel the influence of Alexander is necessarily combined with that of his successors. They represented the several phases of his character; and to the Jews nationally the policy of the Syrian kings was of greater importance than the original conquest of Asia. But some traits of “the first mighty king”¹³ are given with vigorous distinctness. The emblem by which he is typified¹⁴ suggests the notions of strength and speed; and the universal extent and marvelous rapidity of his conquests are brought forward as the characteristics of his power, which was directed by the strongest personal impetuosity.¹⁵ He “ruled with great dominion, and did according to his will; and there was none that could deliver . . . out of his hand.”¹⁶

The tradition of his visit to Jerusalem, whether true or false to fact, presents an aspect of Alexander’s character which has been frequently lost sight of by his recent biographers. He was not simply a Greek, nor must he be judged by a Greek standard. The Orientalism, which was a scandal to his followers, was a necessary deduction from his principles, and not the result of caprice or vanity. He approached the idea of a uni-

¹⁰ This silence must not be overestimated. The neglect of the Macabæan war by the historians of the Greek kingdom of Syria, is an indication already of that somewhat affected contempt which at a later period was expressed by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 8).

¹¹ *Heccat. ap. Joseph. c. Apion. i. 22.*

¹² *Curt. iv. 8, 10.* Andromachus was burned alive at Samaria.

¹³ *Dan. viii. 21, xi. 3.*

¹⁴ A *he-goat*, from the Hebr. “*tephar*,” *he leapt*.

¹⁵ *Dan. viii. 5.* “From the west on the face of the whole earth . . . he touched not the ground.” *Dan. viii. 6.* “In the fury of his power.”

¹⁶ *Dan. viii. 7, xi. 3.*

versal monarchy from the side of Greece, but his final object was to establish something higher than the paramount supremacy of one people. His purpose was to combine and equalize—not to annihilate: to wed the East and West in a just union—not to enslave Asia to Greece. The time, indeed, was not yet come when this was possible; but if he could not accomplish the great issue, he prepared the way for its accomplishment.

// The first and most direct consequence of the policy of Alexander was the weakening of nationalities, the first condition necessary for the dissolution of the old religions. The swift course of his victories, the constant incorporation of foreign elements in his armies, the fierce wars and changing fortunes of his successors, broke down the barriers by which kingdom had been separated from kingdom, and opened the road for larger conceptions of life and faith than had hitherto been possible. The contact of the East and West brought out into practical forms thoughts and feelings which had been confined to the schools. Paganism was deprived of life as soon as it was transplanted beyond the narrow limits in which it took its shape. The spread of commerce followed the progress of arms; and the Greek language and literature vindicated their claim to be considered the most perfect expression of human thought by becoming practically universal. |

The Jews were at once most exposed to the powerful influences thus brought to bear upon the East, and most able to support them. In the arrangement of the Greek conquests, which followed the battle of Ipsus B.C. 301, Judæa was made the frontier land of the rival empires of Syria and Egypt; and though it was necessarily subjected to the constant vicissitudes of war, it was able to make advantageous terms with the state to which it owed allegiance, from the important advantages which it offered for attack or defense. Internally also the people were prepared to withstand the effects of the revolution which the Greek dominion effected. The constitution of Ezra had obtained its full development. A powerful hierarchy had succeeded in substituting the idea of a church for that of a state, and the Jew was now able to wander over the world and yet remain faithful to the God of his fathers. The same constitutional change had strengthened the intellectual and religious position of the people. A rigid fence of ritualism protected the course of common life from the license of Greek manners; and the great doctrine of the unity of God, which was now seen to be the divine centre of their system, counteracted the attractions of a philosophic pantheism. Through

a long course of discipline, in which they had been left unguided by prophetic teaching, the Jews had realized the nature of their mission to the world, and were waiting for the means of fulfilling it. The conquest of Alexander furnished them with the occasion and the power. But at the same time the example of Greece fostered personal as well as popular independence. Judaism was speedily divided into sects, analogous to the typical forms of Greek philosophy. But even the rude analysis of the old faith was productive of good. The freedom of Greece was no less instrumental in forming the Jews for their final work than the contemplative spirit of Persia, or the civil organization of Rome; for if the career of Alexander was rapid, its effects were lasting. The city which he chose to bear his name perpetuated in after ages the office which he providentially discharged for Judaism and mankind; and the historian of Christianity must confirm the judgment of Arrian, that Alexander, "who was like no other man, could not have been given to the world without the special design of Providence." And Alexander himself appreciated this design better even than his great teacher; for it is said¹⁷ that when Aristotle urged him to treat the Greeks as freemen and the Orientals as slaves, he found the true answer to this counsel in the recognition of his divine mission to unite and reconcile the world.

§ 4. Jaddua was succeeded, some time before the death of Alexander, by his son ONIAS I., who was high-priest from about B.C. 330 to B.C. 309, or, according to Eusebius, B.C. 300. In the division of the empire of Alexander, Palestine was treated, as it had always been considered by the Greeks, as a part of Syria; and so it fell to the lot of Laomedon, who was dispossessed, in B.C. 321–320, by Ptolemy, the son of Lagus, the powerful satrap of Egypt. Ptolemy took Jerusalem by assaulting it on the Sabbath, when the Jews would offer no resistance.¹⁸ He carried off a large number¹⁹ of Jewish and Samaritan captives to Alexandria, where he gave them the full citizenship; and many others migrated to Egypt of their own accord. In the wars that followed, Palestine was alternately the prize of victory to Antigonus and Ptolemy, till the peace which followed the battle of Ipsus assigned it to Ptolemy, with Phœnicia and Cœlesyria, as a dependency of the kingdom of Egypt, B.C. 301. It was subject to the first five Ptolemies for about a century B.C. 301–198. The sufferings inflicted upon

¹⁷ Plutarch, *de Alex. Or.* 1, § 6.

¹⁸ Joseph. *c. Ap.* i. 22; *Ant.* xii. 1. | ¹⁹ Aristæas says 100,000. There seems to be a confusion between this

Palestine and Phœnicia by the wars of the *Diadochi* (as the successors of Alexander were called in Greek) were almost confined to the maritime regions, where the strong cities, such as Gaza, Joppa, and Tyre, were the chief objects of contention. As in the old wars between Assyria and Egypt, Jerusalem lay out of the direct track of the combatants.

§ 5. Just after the battle of Ipsus, the high-priesthood passed to SIMON I. THE JUST, son of Onias I. (about B.C. 300–292). Jewish tradition makes him the greatest of this later line of priests. In the magnificent eulogy of Jesus the son of Sirach, Simon is said to have fortified the temple, doubling the height of the wall, and to have maintained the divine service in the highest splendor. “When he put on the robe of honor, and was clothed with the perfection of glory, when he went up to the holy altar, he made the garment of holiness honorable.”²⁰ Other traditions make Simon the last survivor of the *Great Synagogue of 120*,²¹ who returned with Ezra from the Babylonish Captivity, and ascribe to him the final completion of their great work, the Canon of the Old Testament. They were succeeded by the *New Synagogue*, whose office was to interpret the Scriptures thus completed. Its founder was Antigonus Socho, the first writer of the *Mishna*. He is said to have received from Simon the Just the body of oral tradition handed down from Moses. To him also is ascribed the doctrine, that God ought to be served disinterestedly, and not for the sake of reward; which was perverted by one of his disciples into the denial of all future rewards and punishments. That disciple was Zadok (or Sadduc), founder of the *Sadducees*. But the tradition rests on insufficient evidence, and the etymology is extremely doubtful.²²

The fondness with which Jewish tradition regarded the priesthood of Simon, as the best period of the restored theocracy, is indicated by the prodigies which were said to have heralded impending disaster at its close. “The sacrifices, which were always favorably accepted during his life, at his death became uncertain or unfavorable. The scape-goat, which

statement and that of the 100,000 Jews whom Alexander is said to have settled at Alexandria.

²⁰ Ecclesiasticus i. The whole passage gives a strong impression of the order and purity of divine worship at this period. Dean Milman well calls it “the ideal of the pomp and majesty of a high-priest.” The Talmudists pronounce high eulogi-

ums on a “Simon the Just” (Simon ha Zaddick), without specifying whether they mean Simon I. or Simon II. In fact the characteristics of both seem to be blended in their description.

²¹ See *Old Testament History*, ch. xxvii., *Notes and Illust.* (B.)

²² See Appendix to Book I. On the *Sects of the Jews*.

used to be thrown from a rock, and to be dashed immediately to pieces, escaped (a fearful omen) into the desert. The great west light of the golden chandelier no longer burned with a steady flame—sometimes it was extinguished. The sacrificial fire languished; the sacrificial bread failed, so as not to suffice, as formerly, for the whole priesthood.” (Milman.)

§ 6. Simon the Just was succeeded by his brother ELEAZAR, his son Onias being under age (B.C. 292–251).²³ His long rule seems to have been profoundly tranquil, under the mild governments of Ptolemy I. Soter (the son of Lagus), and PTOLEMY II. PHILADELPHUS, who succeeded his father in B.C. 285 and reigned till B.C. 247.

To this king’s literary tastes, and to the co-operation of Eleazar, the tradition preserved by Aristeas ascribes the Greek Version of the Jewish Scriptures, which is called the SEPTUAGINT, from its seventy or seventy-two translators.²⁴ Much as there is erroneous and even fabulous in the tradition, there can be no doubt that the first portion of the translation was executed at this time by learned Jews at Alexandria. The work marks an important epoch in Jewish history; not merely the embodiment of the sacred writings in a form in which they might act upon the Gentile world, but, conversely, the growing strength of those influences which are denoted by the general name of *Hellenism*. The conquests of Alexander, and the kingdoms founded by his successors in Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, had led to a most powerful infusion of Greek population, manners, literature, art, and religion throughout Western Asia, and Greek was rapidly becoming a universal language in that region. The Jews of Egypt, whose numbers, from the successive migrations we have noticed, were now very large, had doubtless become so far *hellenized*, that a Greek version of the Scriptures may have been as much needed for their use as for Ptolemy’s curiosity. Thus it happened, in the Divine Providence, that the growth of Oriental Hellenism prepared the way for the spread of Christianity, not only by imbuing half the world with a common civilization and a common language, but by providing in that language the sacred standard of divine truth, by which the Messiah’s claims were to be established, and the words of which he was to fulfill. But meanwhile that same Hellenism brought upon the Jews a new series of national trials. The Jews of Palestine appear to have been

²³ Manasseh, the brother of Eleazar, was associated with him in the priesthood, and held it after him till B.C. 240.

²⁴ Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 2. See Appendix to Book I.

thus far singularly free from hellenizing tendencies; but the time soon came when their exemption was no longer preserved.

After the successive rules of his uncles Eleazar and Manasseh, ONIAS II. at length entered on the high-priesthood in B.C. 240. He endangered the long friendship with Egypt by neglecting to pay the annual tribute of twenty talents to PTOLEMY III. EUERGETES, who had succeeded his father in B.C. 247. The high-priest's unseasonable avarice led to the first interruption of that kindly policy which the first three Ptolemies had uniformly preserved toward Judæa, and he was too indolent to obey the summons to answer for his conduct, under the threat of invasion. An open rupture was only averted by the policy of the high-priest's nephew, JOSEPH, the son of Tobias, who forms as great a contrast to his uncle, as Antipater and Herod afterward did to the imbecile Hyrcanus. Joseph borrowed the money for his journey from some rich Samaritans, and traveled to Alexandria in the company of certain Phœnician merchants, from whom he learned the sum they intended to bid for the farming of the tribute of Palestine, Phœnicia, and Cœlesyria. Having succeeded in appeasing Ptolemy by representing the weakness of Onias, Joseph offered to double the sum of 8000 talents, at which the merchants proposed to farm the revenues; and, when asked for his sureties, named the king and queen themselves, secure in the progress he had made in the royal favor.²⁵ He obtained the contract. By a few severe examples, as at Ascalon and Scythopolis, he succeeded in discharging his office, and in establishing a civil authority side by side with that of the high-priest. His rule lasted for twenty-two years, and the power which he had set up in the state became a source of evils as great as the danger from which he had delivered it.

§ 7. Onias II. died in B.C. 226, and was succeeded by his son SIMON II.; and four years later the crown of Egypt passed to PTOLEMY IV. PHILOPATOR (B.C. 222–205). Meanwhile the rival kingdom of the Seleucidæ, in Syria, had reached the climax of its power, and the throne had just been ascended by the most ambitious of its kings, ANTIOCHUS III. THE GREAT (B.C. 223–187). He made war on Ptolemy for the provinces of Phœnicia, Cœlesyria, and Palestine; but was defeated at the battle of Raphia, near Gaza, B.C. 217. After this victory, Ptolemy went to Jerusalem; and, not content with offering sacrifices, he entered the Holy of Holies, whence he is said to have

²⁵ It is recorded, as a proof of the good-will of Ptolemy Euergetes to the Jews, that he offered sacrifices at Jerusalem.

been driven out by a supernatural terror. He gave vent to his resentment by a cruel persecution of the Jews at Alexandria, the first example of such a measure for nearly 200 years. Its consequence was the alienation of the Jews both of Palestine and Egypt.

The death of Ptolemy Philopator, when his son PTOLEMY V. EPIPHANES²⁶ (B.C. 205–181) was only five years old, gave a new opening to the ambition of Antiochus the Great. That king, who had been occupied for the last twelve years in subduing a revolt in Asia Minor and attempting in vain to recover the provinces beyond the Tigris from the Parthians and Bactrians, formed a league with PHILIP V. OF MACEDON, for the partition of Ptolemy's dominions. After a fierce contest, in which Judæa suffered severely, Antiochus became master of Cœlesyria and Palestine (B.C. 198). The Jews, who had again been ill-treated by Scopas, the general of Ptolemy, welcomed Antiochus as a deliverer. He granted them an annual sum for the sacrifices, and forbade foreigners to enter the temple.

§ 8. In the same year, Simon II. was succeeded in the high-priesthood by his son ONIAS III. (B.C. 198–171). The conquered provinces were restored to Ptolemy Epiphanes as the dowry of his bride, Cleopatra, the daughter of Antiochus; but the Syrian king did not give up their possession; and he resumed them altogether by the treaty with Rome in B.C. 188. He lost his life in the following year. It is under his son and successor, SELEUCUS IV. PHILOPATOR (B.C. 187–175), that the writer of the *Second Book of Maccabees* places the attempt of Heliodorus to seize the treasures of the temple, and his miraculous repulse.²⁷ The story, of which Josephus knows nothing, illustrates the tendency of apocryphal writers to adorn their books with feeble imitations of the miracles recorded in the Scriptures. All we know for certain is, that Onias could scarcely maintain his favor with Seleucus against the machinations of Simon, the treasurer of the temple, who is said to have instigated the sacrilege; and the bloody feud thus commenced between the partisans of the high-priest and those of Simon hastened the calamities that followed the transfer of the supremacy to Syria.²⁸

The accession of ANTIOCHUS IV. EPIPHANES (B.C. 175–164)

²⁶ This is the king whose coronation decree, inscribed on the "Rosetta Stone," has afforded the foundation for the art of deciphering the Egyptian hieroglyphics. ²⁷ 2 Macc. iii.

²⁸ Simon is called a Benjamite. Upon the difficulties respecting the family to which he belonged, and the exact nature of his office, see *Dict. of Bible*, vol. iii. p. 1319, etc.

secured the triumph of the Syrian party in Judæa. This prince, whose conduct, as well as his end, gained him the nickname of *Epimanes* (the madman) had been sent by his father, Antiochus the Great, as a hostage to Rome. He returned with a contempt for his subjects added to that love of oriental luxury which the kings of Syria had now acquired; but his vices might have been chiefly dangerous to himself had not his Roman education inflamed the ambition which he inherited from his father. He found the Jewish high-priest at Antioch, whither Onias had gone to clear himself from the accusations of Simon, which were backed by the hostility of Apollonius, the governor of Cœlesyria. The Greek party were represented, not only by Simon, but by the high-priest's own brother, Joshua (Jesus), who went so far as to adopt the Greek name of Jason. By an enormous bribe in money and promises of annual tribute, JASON (B.C. 175–172) obtained the high-priesthood, while Onias III. was deposed, and detained at Antioch.²⁹ For the first time, Greek customs were openly introduced into Judæa, with a success which shows to what an extent the Jews had already become hellenized in spirit. Not content with surrendering the privileges of free worship obtained from former kings,³⁰ and neglecting the services of the temple, Jason built a gymnasium, where the Jewish youth practiced the Greek athletic exercises, some of them even obliterating the mark of circumcision.³¹ Jason also sent representatives to the quinquennial games of the Tyrian Hercules, with large presents, which even his envoys scrupled to apply to the heathen sacrifices, but bestowed them for building ships.³²

In three years, however, Jason was in his turn undermined by MENELAUS (B.C. 172–168),³³ whom he had sent to Antioch with the tribute, and who obtained the high-priesthood by flattering the king's vanity and offering a higher bribe. He arrived at Jerusalem, "having the fury of a cruel tyrant and the rage of a wild beast," while Jason fled to the Ammonites.³⁴ Unable to raise the money he had promised, Menelaus was summoned to Antioch. He sold some of the vessels of the

²⁹ 2 Macc. iv. 1-9.

³⁰ It appears from 2 Macc. iv. 11, that these privileges had been recently ratified through the agency of John, the father of Eupolemus, whom Judas Maccabæus afterward sent as an envoy to Rome.

³¹ 1 Macc. i. 10-15; 2 Macc. iv. 10-17.

³² 2 Macc. iv. 18-20.

³³ According to Josephus, this was a younger brother of Onias III and Jason, who had changed his own name, Onias, to Menelaus (*Ant.* xii. 5, § 1); but in 2 Macc. iv. 23, he is made the brother of Simon the Benjamite. If so, his usurpation carried the high-priesthood out of the house of Aaron.

³⁴ 2 Macc. iv. 23-26.

temple to the Tyrians, in order to bribe Andronicus, who governed Antioch during the king's absence in Cilicia. The deposed high-priest, Onias, who was still at Antioch, charged Menelaus with the sacrilege, and fled for sanctuary to the sacred grove of Daphne. At the instigation of Menelaus, Andronicus enticed Onias from the sanctuary and put him to death (B.C. 171). Antiochus, who returned about this time, was moved to pity by the blameless character of Onias; and, perceiving doubtless the treasonable schemes of Andronicus, he put the murderer to death. Meanwhile a great tumult had broken out at Jerusalem, in consequence of the sacrileges committed by Lysimachus, the brother and deputy of Menelaus. Lysimachus was killed, and Menelaus was accused before Antiochus, when he reached Tyre on his way to attack Egypt; but Menelaus escaped through bribery, and his accusers were punished for the insurrection.*

§ 9. We must here glance at the relations of Syria toward Egypt. PTOLEMY VI. PHILOMETOR was an infant when he succeeded his father in B.C. 181; but the government was ably conducted by his mother Cleopatra, the sister of Antiochus Epiphanes. Her death (B.C. 173) led to a war with Syria, and Antiochus successfully conducted four campaigns against Egypt (B.C. 171-168), from which he only retired on the haughty mandate of the Roman ambassador, M. Popillius Lænas. During the second of these campaigns (B.C. 170), a report was spread of the king's death. Jason attacked Jerusalem at the head of 1000 men, and drove Menelaus into the citadel; but, after great cruelties against the citizens, he was compelled to fly to the land of Ammon. Thence he fled to Egypt, and afterward to Sparta, where he sought protection on some claim of kindred, and there he "perished in a strange land."** Meanwhile his attempt had the most extraordinary consequences in the history of the Jews.

Antiochus was led to believe that Judæa had revolted, an idea no doubt encouraged by Menelaus, in order to get rid of his own enemies. The king returned from Egypt in a state of fury; took Jerusalem by storm, slaying young and old, women and maidens. Forty thousand fell in the conflict, and as many were sold into slavery. Guided by Menelaus, he entered the temple, profaned the altar by the sacrifice of a swine, and having caused part of its flesh to be boiled, he sprinkled the broth

* 2 Macc. iv. 28-50.

** 2 Macc. v. 5-10. The alleged kindred between the Jews and Spartans is alluded to in 1 Macc. xii. 7. The story of the Spartan embassy is supported by no other authority.

over the whole sanctuary, and polluted the Holy of Holies with filth. He carried off the sacred vessels and other treasures, to the amount of 1800 talents, and returned to Antioch, leaving a savage Phrygian, named Philip, as his governor at Jerusalem, and Andronicus at Gerizim, where the Samaritan temple seems to have been profaned in like manner.³⁷ Menelaus, who is stigmatized as the worst of all the three, is not again named in the *Books of Maccabees*. His subsequent death under Antiochus Eupator was regarded as a judgment for his crimes (B.C. 163).³⁸

§ 10. Two years later (B.C. 168) Antiochus vented upon Judæa the exasperation of his dismissal from Egypt. Policy too, as well as passion, may have urged him to destroy a province now thoroughly disaffected, and likely soon to fall into the power of Egypt. Apollonius, the old enemy of the Jews, was sent to Jerusalem at the head of 22,000 men, with orders to slay all the male adults, and to seize the women and children. Pretending that his mission was friendly, he waited till the Sabbath, and then fell upon the unresisting people. A frightful massacre took place: the city was pillaged and set on fire: its fortifications were dismantled: and a tower was erected on Mount Zion, overlooking both the temple and the city, from which the garrison sallied forth upon all who dared to resort to the deserted sanctuary. Then followed one of the severest persecutions recorded in the history of religion.³⁹ Antiochus issued an edict for uniformity of worship throughout his dominions, and committed its execution in Samaria and Judæa to an old man named Athenæus,⁴⁰ one of those fanatics who have been produced by heathenism, as well as by religions that claim a more earnest faith. A strong element of such fanaticism may be traced in the character of Antiochus himself. While his quick and versatile Greek temperament, trained in Roman ideas of power, and corrupted by oriental luxury, led him to indulge in all the vices and freaks for which despotism supplied the means—at one time rioting through the streets of Antioch with his boon companions, at another going through a mock canvass for the Roman magistracies, and pretending to hold them—he was all the while a munificent and bigoted supporter of the Greek worship. “The admirers,” says Dean Milman, “of the mild genius of the Grecian religion, and those who suppose religious persecution unknown in the world to the era of Christianity, would do well to consider the wanton

³⁷ 1 Macc. i. 20-28, ii. 11-23.

³⁸ Joseph. xiii. 3, 4.

³⁹ 1 Macc. i. 29, foll.; 2 Macc. v. 24-26.

⁴⁰ 2 Macc. vi. 1: this seems clearly to be a proper name.

and barbarous attempt of Antiochus to exterminate the religion of the Jews and substitute that of the Greeks."

The Samaritans submitted without resistance, and their temple on Mount Gerizim was dedicated to Zeus Xenius. At Jerusalem Athenæus began his work by converting the sanctuary into a temple of Zeus Olympius. Its courts were polluted by the most licentious orgies; the altar was loaded with abominable offerings; and the old idolatry of Baal was re-established in the obscene form in which it had been carried to Greece—the phallic revels of Dionysus. The copies of the Book of the Law were either destroyed, or profaned by heathen and doubtless obscene pictures.⁴¹ The practice of Jewish rites, and the refusal to sacrifice to the Greek gods, were alike punished with death. Two women, who had circumcised their children, were led round the city with the babes hanging at their breasts, and then cast headlong from the wall. A company of worshipers were burned by Philip in a cave, to which they had fled to keep the Sabbath. The favorite test of conformity was the compulsion to eat swine's flesh; and two particular cases of heroic resistance make this one of the brightest pages in Jewish and Christian martyrology. A chief scribe, named ELEAZAR, a man of noble person and ninety years of age, when a piece of swine's flesh was thrust into his mouth, spat it out, and willingly offered his body to the torments. When some of the officers, for old acquaintance sake, besought him to provide some meat, and eat it as if it were the unclean food, he made a reply which contains the whole justification of the martyr's constancy to death: "It becometh not our age in anywise to dissemble, whereby many young persons might think that Eleazar, being fourscore years old and ten, were now gone to a strange religion, and so through mine hypocrisy, and desire to live a little time, should be deceived by me, and I get a stain to my old age, and make it abominable. For though for the present time I should be delivered from the punishment of men, yet I should not escape the hand of the Almighty, neither alive, nor dead." He concluded by declaring his resolve, "to leave a notable example to such as be young to die willingly and courageously for the honorable and holy laws." His tempters, incensed at his obstinacy, grew doubly cruel, and, as he was expiring beneath their blows, he cried—"It is manifest unto Jehovah, that hath the holy knowledge, that whereas I might have been delivered from death, I endure sore pains in

⁴¹ 1 Macc. iii. 48.

body by being beaten; but in soul am well content to suffer these things, because I fear Him."⁴² Thus was he "tortured," not accepting deliverance, that he might obtain a better resurrection;" and he is included, with the other martyrs of the age, in the "cloud of martyrs," "of whom the world was not worthy," "who obtained a good report through faith." Some Christian writers have called him "the proto-martyr of the Old Covenant," a glory, however, which belongs to Abel.⁴³

"Others had trial of mockings and scourgings." Such was the fate of the seven brethren who, with their mother, were brought into the king's own presence," and, having refused to eat swine's flesh, were put to death with insults and torments, of which the horrid details may be read in the original text. From the eldest to the youngest, they displayed not only constancy but triumph; and the mother, after encouraging each in his turn, herself suffered last.⁴⁴ The atrocities committed at Jerusalem were rivaled in the country. But at this very crisis, when the worship and the people of Jehovah seemed doomed to extinction, a new light arose for both; and the result showed how needful was the baptism of fire to purify the people from the corruptions of Hellenism.

Meanwhile the persecutor himself became a signal example of the retribution which awaits despotic power and unbridled passion; and, before relating the resurrection of Judæa under the Maccabees, we may anticipate the short period of four years, to notice the fate of Antiochus Epiphanes. He was in the eastern provinces, when he heard of the revolt of Judæa and the defeat of his general Lysias. Hastening back to avenge the disgrace, he attacked a temple at Elymais, the very place where his father had lost his life in a similar attempt. The mortification of being repulsed seems to have brought to a climax the madness which despotism usually engenders; and he died in a raving frenzy at Tabæ in Persia, B.C. 164. His end was regarded, by Greeks as well as Jews, as a judgment for his sacrilegious crimes; and he has left to history a name as odious as that of Nero, with whose character he had many points in common.

⁴² 2 Macc. vi.

⁴³ Heb. xi. 35, 36. The very word chosen by the apostle, *ἐτυμπανίσθησαν*, expresses the kind of torture inflicted on Eleazar and other martyrs of this time. The whole passage clearly shows that the writer had them in his mind, though their history is not recorded in the canonical Scriptures.

⁴⁴ Chrysostom, *Hom. iii. in Macc.*; Ambros. *de Jacob. ii. 10.*

⁴⁵ Whether Antiochus visited Jerusalem during the persecution, or whether they were carried to him at Antioch or elsewhere, does not clearly appear.

⁴⁶ 2 Macc. vii.

§ 11. It is very remarkable that this great persecution, and the subsequent history of the glorious regeneration of Judæa under the Maccabees, should have been passed over by the Greek and Roman historians. From Polybius we might have expected a just appreciation of its importance, and an impartial summary of its facts; but of this portion of his work only a few fragments remain, and the silence of Livy, who closely follows his history of Syria, seems to imply that of his great authority. Appian's meagre summary of Syrian history takes no notice of the Jews. Diodorus gives a very brief account of them, repeating the current prejudices, not as his own belief, but as arguments used by the counselors of Antiochus to urge the extirpation of the Jews.⁴⁷ The contemptuous summary given by Tacitus is even more significant than the silence of the rest, and shows how far prejudice can lead even the most careful writers from the truth. He speaks as follows:—"During the dominion of the Assyrians, the Medes, and the Persians, the Jews were the most abject of their dependent subjects. After the Macedonians obtained the supremacy of the East, King Antiochus endeavored to do away with their superstition and introduce Greek habits, but was hindered by a Parthian war from reforming a most repulsive people."⁴⁸

The spirit of this passage may explain the indifference of other authors. The uncompromising devotion of the Jews to their religion and their national traditions, and their claim to be worshipers of the only true God, excited among the heathen, and especially those who laid claim to philosophy, the same affected contempt and unaffected resentment which led Gibbon to sneer at Palestine as a country no larger nor more favored by nature than Wales. Nor is it only this brilliant passage of the Jewish annals that escaped the notice and the sympathy of the western historians. The period of 370 years, from the Decree of Cyrus to the revolt of the Maccabees, embraces the most brilliant events of Greek and Roman history. The aristocratic republics of Greece and the monarchy of Rome had reached their climax at its commencement, amidst the rapid growth of philosophy and art. Its first quarter of a century beheld the expulsion of the Pisistratids from Athens and the Tarquins from Rome. The struggles which placed Rome at the head of the Italian states, and formed her republican constitution, the Persian and Peloponnesian wars, the conflict of the Greek states for the supremacy

⁴⁷ Lib. xxxix. Ecl. 1; xl. Ecl. 1. ⁴⁸ *Tiderrimam gentem*, Tac. Hist. v. 8.

which they at last yielded to the Macedonian, and the very conquest which brought Alexander to Judæa, are all related just as they might have been if there had been no such nation as the Jews. The keen inquiries of Herodotus, who visited Egypt and Tyre at the very time when Ezra and Nehemiah were regulating the restored state, produced nothing but the notice of Necho's victory over Josiah and capture of Cadytis (probably Gaza), the mistake "that the Syrians of Palestine" learned circumcision from the Egyptians, and the mention of them as serving with the Phœnicians in the fleet of Xerxes.⁴⁹

The silence of the historians of Alexander and his successors about the Jewish people is the more remarkable, as they have to mention Judæa as the scene of war; it is matched by the Romans even when they come into contact with Syria and Egypt; nor is it even broken when (if we may believe the historian of the Maccabees) Rome formed an alliance with Judas Maccabæus. A century later, when Pompey penetrated into the temple, the sacred city suggests even to Cicero nothing better than a nickname for his distrusted leader; nor does Tacitus notice the very advent of Christ with half the interest he shows in the relations of the Herodian princes to the Cæsars. Surely we can not but see in all this a divine purpose, that the outer, like the inner life, of the chosen people, should lie hidden from the world at large, and pursue a course apart from the ordinary current of warlike and political conflict, till from their bosom should emerge the band of lowly and unworldly men, who were to proclaim a "kingdom not of this world."

§ 12. In preparation for that event, the Jewish people had a history of its own, for which we could wish to possess more abundant materials. They had resumed the ordinances of their religion, purified from their old idolatries by the Captivity, and with their zeal constantly stimulated by antagonism with the Samaritans. Politically, they were subject first to Persia, and then to Egypt; but, as long as their tribute was paid, their relations to their sovereign were kindly, and they were left to the government of their high-priests and patriarchal princes; till the great Syrian persecution. The extinction of royalty, after it had served its purpose by giving an image of Messiah's kingdom, removed the chief influence which had led to apostasy in Israel and to idolatry in Judah; and the very dependence which debarred them from political freedom gave them the better opportunity for religious or

⁴⁹ Herod. ii. 104, 106, 159, iii. 5, vii. 89.

ganization. The band by which the "people of God" were held together was at length felt to be religious and not local; and all the more so from the existence of large portions of the nation separate from the rest, in the great Eastern "dispersion," or in the new community formed in Egypt. The Jews incorporated in different nations still looked to Jerusalem as the centre of their faith. The boundaries of Canaan were passed; and the beginnings of a spiritual dispensation were already made. But this process could not work unmixed good. "In the darkness of this long period, Judaism, with its stern and settled aversion to all polytheism, to Gentile influences, gradually hardened into its rigid exclusiveness. . . . Conflicting opinions, which grew up under the Asmonæan princes into religious factions, those of the Pharisees and Sadducees, began to stir in the religious mind and heart of the people. The old Nazaritism grew toward the latter Essenism."⁸⁰

The Jews restored to Palestine resumed their agricultural life on a land rendered doubly fertile by having "enjoyed her Sabbaths as long as she lay desolate, to fulfill threescore and ten years;"⁸¹ and it may be observed in passing, that the ordinance of the Sabbatic year, which had been so systematically neglected before the Captivity, was observed in the Maccabæan age. How the land was divided among the returned families we are not told; but thus much seems clear, that it soon fell chiefly into the hands of the nobles, who, becoming rapidly enriched through the fertility of the soil, resumed that course of oppression toward the poor, which the old prophets had so vehemently denounced as the crying sin of their class. An order which thus sets itself above the social bonds of mutual kindness is prone to maintain its consequence against popular discontent by foreign influence; and, just as the princes of Judah headed the idolatrous and Egyptian party in the last days of the monarchy, so now they were the leaders of the Syrian and hellenizing party. Their influence was resisted, as formerly by the prophets, so now by the priests, who headed the glorious uprising of the nation in defense of their religion. The issue of that contest proves that the nation was still sound at heart at the time of the Syrian domination.

⁸⁰ Milman.⁸¹ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

KINGS OF THE GREEK KINGDOM OF SYRIA.

| Kings. | Length of Reign. | Date of Accession. |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Seleucus I. Nicator | 33 years. | Oct. 312. |
| 2. Antiochus I. Soter | 19 " | Jan. 280. |
| 3. Antiochus II. Theos | 15 " | Jan. 261. |
| 4. Seleucus II. Callinicus | 20 " | Jan. 246. |
| 5. Seleucus III. Ceraunus | 3 " | Aug. 226. |
| 6. Antiochus III. the Great | 36 " | Aug. 223. |
| 7. Seleucus IV. Philopator | 12 " | Oct. 187. |
| 8. Antiochus IV. Epiphanes | 11 " | Aug. 175. |
| 9. Antiochus V. Eupator | 2 " | Dec. 164. |
| 10. Demetrius I. Soter | 12 " | Nov. 162. |
| 11. Al-xander Balas | 5 " | Aug. 150. |
| 12. { Demetrius II. Nicator (1st reign)
Antiochus VI. Theos
Tryphon } | 0 " | Nov. 146. |
| 13. Antiochus VII. Sidetes | 9 " | Feb. 137. |
| { Demetrius II. Nicator (2d reign)
Al-xander Zebina } | 3 " | Feb. 128. |
| 14. Seleucus V. | " " | Feb. 125. |
| 15. Antiochus VIII. Grypus | 13 " | Aug. 125. |
| 16. Antiochus IX. Cyzenicus | 19 " | 113. |
| 17. Seleucus VI. | " " | " " |
| 18. Antiochus X. Eusebes Philippus | 12 " | 95. |
| 19. Tigranes | 14 " | 83. |
| 20. Demetrius III. Eucærus | " " | " " |
| 21. Antiochus XI. Epiphanes | " " | " " |
| 22. Antiochus XII. Dionysus | " " | " " |
| 23. Antiochus Asiaticus | 4 " | 69. |

and next the king's commissioner, on the altar itself, which he then pulled down; just as his ancestor Phinehas had slain Zimri.⁴ Having proclaimed throughout the city, that all who were zealous for the law and covenant should follow him, Mattathias fled with his sons to the mountains; and was joined by "many that sought after justice and judgment." The destruction of a thousand of the fugitives, who would not break the Sabbath by fighting, led Mattathias and his friends to declare the lawfulness of self-defense upon the Sabbath. Among their first adherents were the ASSIDÆANS (*Chasîdim*, *pious* or *holy*), a sect or society who had bound themselves by a special vow to the observance of the law.⁵ Issuing from their mountain-fastnesses, they broke down the heathen altars, and killed many of the worshipers, while others fled to the Syrians; they circumcised children by force, and recovered many copies of the law. But the work was too arduous for the aged Mattathias. After a noble exhortation to his sons, encouraging them by the examples of the ancient worthies, from Abraham to Daniel, and having appointed his son Judas his successor, he died, and was buried at Modin, in the sepulchre of his fathers (B.C. 167).⁶

§ 2. JUDAS, the third and most warlike of the sons of Mattathias, and hence surnamed MACCABÆUS (the *Hammerer*), proved to Judæa what our Alfred was to England, Bruce to

⁴ 1 Macc. ii. 15-26, 54; comp. Num. xxv.

⁵ *Chasîdim* (Ἀσιδαῖοι; *Assidæi*; i. e. the pious "puritans;" οἱ εὐσεβεῖς, οἱ ὅσιοι), was the name assumed by a section of the orthodox Jews (1 Macc. ii. 42, alii Ἰουδαίων probably by correction; 1 Macc. vii. 13; 2 Macc. xiv. 6), as distinguished from "the impious" (οἱ ἀσεβεῖς, 1 Macc. iii. 8, vi. 21, vii. 5, etc.), "the lawless" (οἱ ἀνόμοι, 1 Macc. iii. 6, ix. 23, etc.), "the transgressors" (οἱ παράνομοι, 1 Macc. i. 11, etc.), that is, the hellenizing faction. They appear to have existed as a party before the Maccabæan rising, and were probably bound by some peculiar vow to the external observance of the Law (1 Macc. ii. 42, ἐκουσιάζεσθαι τῷ νόμῳ). They were among the first to join Mattathias (1 Macc. l. c.); and seem afterward to have been merged in the general body of the faithful (2 Macc. xiv. 6,

οἱ λεγόμενοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ἀσιδαῖοι, ὧν ἀφηγεῖται Ἰούδας ὁ Μακκαβαῖος . . .) When Bacchides came against Jerusalem they used their influence (1 Macc. vii. 13, πρῶτοι οἱ Ἀσιδ. ἦσαν ἐν υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ) to conclude a peace, because "a priest of the seed of Aaron" (Alcimus) was with him, and sixty of them fell by his treachery. The name *Chasîdim* occurs frequently in the Psalms (e. g. Ps. lxxix. 2=1 Macc. vii. 17; cxxxii. 9, etc.); and it has been adopted in recent times by a sect of Polish Jews, who take as the basis of their mystical system the doctrines of the Cabalistic book Zohar. Some historians see in the *Chasîdim* the prototype of the sect of the Pharisees.

⁶ 1 Macc. ii. 49-70. The passage gives striking characters of Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah, and Daniel and his three comrades. ⁷ 1 Macc. ii. 66.

Scotland, and Tell to Switzerland. His noble character, which the historian describes in glowing terms, commanded the cheerful submission of his brethren and friends. He carried on his father's course of operations, in which he seems already to have been the chief leader under him.⁹ Venturing privately into the towns, Judas and his friends gathered an army of about 6000 worshipers of Jehovah.⁹ After training his followers by night attacks and surprises,¹⁰ he defeated the army of Apollonius, who marched against him from Samaria, slew the general, and ever afterward wore his sword.¹¹ Another great host, led by Seron, the governor of Cœlesyria, was routed in the passes of Beth-horon, after a noble address of Judas before the battle. The Syrians fled, with the loss of about 800 men, down the pass to the plain of the Philistines, just as the Canaanites had fled before Joshua over the same ground.¹²

§ 3. Antiochus was the more enraged at the news, as his finances were in disorder. The hellenizing policy, which he had pursued as rashly in other provinces as in Judæa, had created wide-spread disaffection, and Armenia and Persia, in particular, had refused to pay tribute. He called out all his forces; and, having exhausted his treasure in giving them a year's pay in advance, he marched into Persia to recruit his finances, leaving half his forces to Lysias, a noble of the royal blood, whom he made his lieutenant west of the Euphrates, and guardian of his infant son, Antiochus. Lysias, having been commissioned to extirpate *the whole* Jewish nation, gave his orders to Ptolemy Macron, the governor of Cœlesyria, who sent forth Nicanor and Gorgias, with 40,000 infantry and 7000 cavalry. Judas assembled his 6000 men at the ancient sanctuary of Mizpeh (Jerusalem being still in the hands of Philip), and after solemn religious services, he proclaimed, like Gideon, that all who were timid, as well as those who were exempt by the law from military service, might leave the camp, and encouraged the rest for the battle of the morrow.¹³

During the night, Gorgias marched out of the Syrian camp at Emmaus, with 5000 foot and 1000 chosen horse, to surprise the Jewish camp. Hearing of the movement, Judas left his camp, and appeared at day-break in the plain, with his army now weeded to 3000 men, who "had neither armor nor swords to their minds." The Syrian army under Nicanor was routed, and pursued to Ashdod and Jamnia, with the loss of 3000

⁹ 1 Macc. iii. 1-9; comp. 2 Macc. v. 27, where he alone is mentioned as escaping from Jerusalem to the mountains. ⁹ 2 Macc. viii. 1.

¹⁰ 2 Macc. viii. 5-7.

¹¹ 1 Macc. iii. 10-12.

¹² 1 Macc. iii. 18-24.

¹³ 1 Macc. iii. 27-60.

men. Judas recalled his little army to meet Gorgias, who, finding the Jewish camp deserted, had advanced into the mountains. Learning the victory of the Jews by the smoke of Nicanor's camp, the followers of Gorgias fled. Besides the rich spoils of the Syrian camp, "much gold and silver, and blue silk and purple of the sea, and great riches," there were found a number of merchants from the maritime cities, who had been attracted by Nicanor's promise to sell his prisoners for slaves: these, by a just retribution, were themselves sold into slavery. Having kept the Sabbath which followed the victory with great thanksgivings, Judas crossed the Jordan, and defeated Timotheus and Bacchides, slaying above 20,000 Syrians, and taking many of the strongholds of Gilead (B.C. 167).¹⁴

§ 4. In the following year Lysias, with an army of 60,000 chosen foot and 5000 horse, advanced to Bethsura,¹⁵ where he was met by Judas with only 10,000 men. After his usual fervent prayers and an animating harangue, Judas fell upon the Syrians, and defeated them with the slaughter of 5000 men; and Lysias retreated to Antioch to gather fresh forces. This victory gave the patriots possession of Jerusalem, except the Syrian tower, and Judas employed the respite from incessant war in cleansing the temple, the deserted courts of which were overgrown with tall shrubs, and the chamber of the priests thrown down. The sacred vessels were replaced from the Syrian booty, and the sanctuary was dedicated anew on the 25th of Chisleu, exactly three years after its profanation (Dec. B.C. 166). A festival was kept for eight days, with rejoicings similar to those of the Feast of Tabernacles; the solemnity was made a perpetual institution, and this is the "Feast of the Dedication" mentioned by St. John as being kept in the winter.¹⁶ During this solemnity, Judas had to employ a part of his forces to keep in check the Syrians, who still held the tower on Mount Zion. He afterward secured the temple

¹⁴ 1 Macc. iv. 1.

¹⁵ Beth-zur (*house of the rock*) was a town in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv. 58), a fortress of Rehoboam (2 Chr. xi. 7), and a place of great importance, as we shall see repeatedly, in the Maccabæan wars. The recovery of the site of Beth-zur under the almost identical name of *Beitsûr*, by Wolcott and Robinson (i. 216, note; iii. 277), explains its impregnability, and also the reason for the choice of

its position, since it commands the road from Beersheba and Hebron, which has always been the main approach to Jerusalem from the south.

¹⁶ 1 Macc. iv.; 2 Macc. x. 1-8; John x. 22. Solomon's temple was dedicated at the Feast of Tabernacles. The second temple was dedicated on the 3d of Adar (latter part of February), but of this no anniversary was instituted.

against attacks from that quarter by the erection of a strong wall and towers, well manned. He also fortified and garrisoned Bethsura.¹⁷

§ 5. These successes roused the old jealous enmities of the surrounding nations, who began to massacre the Jews that dwelt among them; but Judas was as prompt to chastise as to deliver. He made a descent on Joppa, and burned many houses and ships, to avenge the treacherous murder of 200 Jews, who had been decoyed on board the vessels in the harbor, and there drowned; and another treacherous massacre at Jamnia was punished by the conflagration of the town and ships, whose flames were seen from Jerusalem, a distance of twenty-five miles.¹⁸ He had returned to Judæa from a campaign against the Idumæans and the Ammonites, when letters arrived announcing the extreme danger of the Jews in Gilead and Galilee. Judas divided his forces, sending his brother Simon into Galilee, while he marched with Jonathan into Gilead. Both expeditions were successful, and future dangers were guarded against by the removal of the Galilean and Trans-jordanic Jews to Jerusalem. In the mean time, Joseph and Azarias, who had been left at Jerusalem with strict orders not to fight, were tempted by the news of these victories to attack Gorgias at Jamnia. They were routed with the loss of 2000 men; but this heavy blow increased the confidence of the people in the Maccabæan brothers as their only worthy leaders; and another slight reverse confirmed the prudence by which Judas regulated his valor. He revenged the defeat, not without considerable loss. "When they proceeded, after

¹⁷ 1 Macc. iv. 60, 61.

¹⁸ 2 Macc. xii. 9. Jamnia or Jabnia (in Hebrew *Jabneel*) is an important place in the Maccabæan war. It was on the northern boundary of Judah, between Ashdod and Joppa, not quite at the sea, though near it (Josh. xv. 11). It had a harbor called, like those of Ascalon and Gaza, *Majumas*, perhaps a Coptic word, meaning the "place on the sea" (Reland, 590, etc.; Raumer, 174 note, 184 note; Kenrick, *Phœnicia*, 27, 29). At the time of the fall of Jerusalem, Jabneh was one of the most populous places of Judæa, and contained a Jewish school of great fame, whose learned doctors are often mentioned in the Talmud. The

great Sanhedrim was also held here. In this holy city, according to an early Jewish tradition, was buried the great Gamaliel. His tomb was visited by Parchi in the 14th century (Zunz, in Asher's *Benj. of Tudela*, ii. 439, 440; also 98). The modern village of *Yebna*, or more correctly *Ibna*, stands about two miles from the sea on a slight eminence just south of the *Nahr Rubin*. It is about eleven miles south of *Jaffa*, seven from *Ramleh*, and four from *Akir* (Ekron). It probably occupies its ancient site, for some remains of old buildings are to be seen, possibly relics of the fortress which the Crusaders built there (Porter, *Hand-book*, 274).

observing the Sabbath in Adullam, to bury the dead, small idols were found in the clothes even of some of the priestly race. A sin-offering was sent to Jerusalem, not only to atone for the guilt of these men, but for the dead, in whose resurrection the Maccabæan Jews, no doubt the Chasîdim, had full faith."¹⁹ He finished the campaign by reducing Hebron, and overrunning the Philistine country and Samaria.²⁰

§ 6. About this time Antiochus Epiphanes died, in the manner already described.²¹ His young son, ANTIOCHUS V. EUPATOR (B.C. 164–162), was placed on the throne by Lysias, and a new campaign was undertaken for the relief of the Syrian garrison, who were now besieged in the citadel of Zion. The king and Lysias laid siege to Bethsura, while Judas hastened to its relief. The Syrian army numbered 80,000 or 100,000 foot, 20,000 horse, and 32 elephants. These beasts, now for the first time mentioned in Jewish warfare, are described as escorted each by 1000 foot and 500 horse; each bore a tower containing 32 men, an exaggeration significant of the alarm caused by the strange sight: and it was believed that they were provoked to fight by the sight of the blood of grapes and mulberries. But the courage of the Jewish patriots was stimulated by the noble example of ELEAZAR, surnamed Avaran, the fourth of the Maccabæan brothers, who crept under an elephant and killed it, but was crushed to death by its fall. Nor did his self-devotion ensure the victory: Judas was compelled to retreat to Jerusalem, and Bethsura capitulated on favorable terms. The fall of the fortress is ascribed to famine, in consequence of the dearth of corn in the Sabbatic year—an incidental proof of the observance of that institution by the restored Jews (B.C. 163). The same cause reduced Jerusalem, which was next besieged, to the last extremities of famine, but drove the besiegers also to straits.

Meanwhile, however, the army which Antiochus Epiphanes had led into Persia returned under Philip, who claimed the guardianship of the young king. Upon this Lysias advised Antiochus to make peace with the Jews. The king was no sooner admitted into the city, than he broke the terms just made by pulling down the new wall of Judas; after which he retired to Antioch, and recovered the capital from Philip. His triumph was brief, for Demetrius, the son of Seleucus IV.—

¹⁹ "2 Macc. xii. 44. For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. This is the earliest distinct assertion of the Jewish belief in the resurrection."—*Milman*.

²⁰ 1 Macc. v.

²¹ Chap. i. § 10

whose rightful inheritance had been usurped by his uncle, Antiochus Epiphanes—returned from Rome, where he had been a hostage, overthrew and put to death Antiochus and Lysias, and became king by the title of DEMETRIUS I. SOTER²² (B.C. 162–150). With more subtle policy than his predecessor, Demetrius availed himself of the divisions among the Jews. The common people appear to have become discontented under the austere yoke of the Assidæans, and impatient of the long sacrifices demanded in the cause of patriotism; and for the first time the hellenizing party was headed by a high-priest, who, unlike the usurpers, Jason and Menelaus, might plead a legitimate title.

Onias III., whose death at Antioch by the artifices of Menelaus has been related, left a son of the same name, who, though he never exercised the high-priesthood at Jerusalem, may be called Onias IV., to avoid confusion. During the usurpation of Jason and Menelaus, Onias seems to have supported an alliance with Egypt, whither he at length fled, and was protected by Ptolemy Philometor.²³ As the legitimate heir to the high-priesthood, he formed the project of reviving in Egypt the worship which had been desecrated in Judæa. Egypt seemed well fitted to form a new centre of hellenistic Judaism by the great number of Jews who had settled there at various times, and by the possession of the Septuagint version of the Scriptures. Onias therefore built a temple, of which he and his family became high-priests; so that there were now three temples, the true one at Jerusalem, the Samaritan on Mount Gerizim, and the hellenistic in Egypt.²⁴

One consequence of the secession of Onias was that, on the execution of Menelaus by order of Antiochus Eupator (about B.C. 163), the high-priesthood of Jerusalem passed out of the line of Jozadak, the father of Jeshua, in which it had remained since the return from the Captivity. Antiochus appointed Joakim²⁴ (Jacimus), who, as Josephus says, was indeed of the

²² 1 Macc. vi.

²³ Joseph. *Ant.* xiii. 3; *B. J.* i. 1, § 1, vii. 10, § 2. The site of the temple is doubtful. The so-called original letters in Josephus place it at Leontopolis in the Heliopolite nome; but Leontopolis was the capital of a nome of its own, and the letters are spurious. Josephus and Ptolemy speak of "region" and "city of Onias," in the Heliopolite nome. Sir Gardner Wilkinson places its site at one of the so-

called "Jewish Mounds" (*Tel-el-Yahooddeeyeh*), about twelve miles north of Heliopolis (*Modern Egypt and Thebes*, vol. i. pp. 297-300). There are numerous other traces of the residence of the Jews on the north-east frontier of Egypt; and, from the mention by Josephus of a "Camp of the Jews" (*Ant.* xiv. 8, § 2), it would seem that they were placed in military stations as the known enemies of Syria.

²⁴ A name equivalent to *Eliakim*

stock of Aaron, but not of this family. **ALCIMUS**, for such was the Greek name which the new high-priest adopted, became the head of the hellenizing party, and courted Demetrius, who sent an army under Bacchides to set up the high-priest at Jerusalem. Their overtures of peace could not deceive Judas; but the Assidæans trusted to the sacred character of the high-priest, who repaid their confidence by killing sixty of them in one day.²⁶

Bacchides returned to Antioch, leaving the high-priest as governor; while the indefatigable Judas went through the cities of Judah rallying the patriots. Alcimus again repaired to Antioch for help; and Nicanor, who was sent to restore him, was defeated by Judas at Capharsalama. He retired to the citadel of Zion, where his refusal to listen to the overtures of the priests until Judas was delivered up to him, and his ferocious cruelties, reunited the patriots in resistance and prayer for his overthrow. A battle ensued at **ADASA**, near Beth-horon, where Judas gained his most glorious victory, on the 13th of Adar (end of February, B.C. 161), a day which was kept as a national festival. Nicanor was slain, and his head and hand were exposed as trophies at Jerusalem. The independence of Judæa was won, though it was not finally secured till after several years of contest, and the death of all the Maccabæan brothers. Meanwhile the land enjoyed a brief interval of rest.²⁷

§ 7. It is at this juncture that the name of **ROME** first appears in Jewish history. The imagination of Judas was captivated by the successes she had gained against the Gauls and Spaniards, and especially over those Greek powers with which he was so fiercely struggling. He had heard of their defeats of Philip, Perseus, and Antiochus the Great, and of their power to set up and cast down kings; but he seems to have been most attracted by their republican form of government.²⁸ He sent to Rome Eupolemus the son of John, with Jason the son of Eleazar, to propose a league against Syria; and the envoys brought back a letter, inscribed on brazen tablets, containing the articles of alliance between the Romans and the Jews.²⁹ But before they reached Judæa, the career of Judas was closed; gloriously indeed, but in a manner which we can scarcely doubt that one of the old prophets would have regarded as a judg-

(*God hath set up*), in Greek *Alcimus*.
Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 9, § 5; 1 Macc. vii.
14.

²⁶ 1 Macc. vii. 1-18.

²⁸ 1 Macc. vii. 19-50; 2 Macc. xv.
36.

²⁹ 1 Macc. viii. 1-16. ²⁷ 1 Macc.
viii. 17-32.

ment for seeking strength from a heathen alliance, as the only error of his life.

Demetrius had sent his whole force, under Bacchides, to restore Alcimus and avenge Nicanor. The treaty with Rome seems to have offended the extreme party of the Assidæans; and Judas had only 3000 men to oppose to the enemy's 20,000 foot and 2000 horse. Their camp was at "Berea" (probably Beeroth), and his at "Elcasa."²⁰ His men, terrified by the disparity of numbers, continued to desert, till only 800 remained. These urged Judas to fly, and wait for a better opportunity. His reply shows that prophetic instinct which has often warned a hero of coming death:—"If our time be come, let us die manfully for our brethren, and let us not stain our honor!" He took post, with his chosen warriors, over against the right wing of the Syrians, where Bacchides commanded. He defeated this wing, the strength of the Syrian army, pursuing them to Azotus. But the Syrians on the left, scarcely meeting with opposition, fell upon the rear of the victorious Jews. The odds were overwhelming; and the disaster was crowned by the death of Judas, whereupon his followers fled. His brothers, Jonathan and Simon, recovered his body, and buried him in his father's sepulchre at Modin, amidst the lamentations of all Israel, as they cried, "How is the valiant man fallen that delivered Israel!"²¹ As Adasa was the Marathon of the Jewish war of freedom, so Eleasa was its Thermopylæ; and, when Scripture history recovers its place in the literature of Christendom, the fame of Leonidas will no longer eclipse that of Judas Maccabæus. His best eulogy is the simple record of his deeds, of which his historian assures us that they were too many to be written.²² "Among those lofty spirits," says Dean Milman, "who have asserted the liberty of their native land against wanton and cruel oppression, none have surpassed the most able of the Maccabees in accomplishing a great end with inadequate means; none ever united more generous valor with a better cause:"²³ none, we may add, more completely gave God the glory. There is at least one worthy tribute to his honor in the splendid oratorio of Handel. His death occurred in B.C. 161.

§ 8. The triumph of Bacchides and the "impious" faction was aided by the distress of a great famine, and the friends

²⁰ 1 Macc. ix. 1-5. The Vulgate has *Laisa*. The position is very uncertain. Some propose to identify it with *Laish*, and even with *Adasa*. It seems to have been on the west slope of the mountains of Judah, above

Ashdod (v. 15). The attacks of the Syrians during this war were chiefly made from that side.

²¹ 1 Macc. ix. 6-23. ²² 1 Macc. ix. 22.

²³ *History of the Jews*, vol. ii. p. 14.

of Judas were hunted down on every side. But, as before, this want of moderation compelled resistance. JONATHAN, surnamed Apphus (the *wary*), the fifth and youngest son of Mattathias, was chosen leader, as the most warlike of the three surviving brothers; Simon aiding him with his counsel. They established themselves in the wilderness of Tekoah, where their first exploit was to avenge their eldest brother JOHN (Johanan), surnamed Gaddis, who was treacherously killed by the Arabs, while conveying some of the effects of the patriots to the care of the Nabathæans. Incensed by this deed, Bacchides, on a Sabbath, attacked their position in the marshes of the Jordan; but they escaped by swimming across the river, having slain 1000 of the Syrians (B.C. 161). Bacchides now occupied himself with fortifying Jericho, Emmaus, Beth-horon, Bethel, and other strong cities in Judah, and he placed in them hostages from the chief families. Alcimus had set to work with equal ardor to pull down the walls round the temple, when he was struck with a palsy, and died in great torment. Upon this, Bacchides returned to Antioch, and the land had rest for two years.²² A last attempt of the hellenizing party to call in the aid of Bacchides proved their ruin; for, enraged by a defeat which he suffered from Jonathan, Bacchides put to death many of the faction who had invited him, and gave up the enterprise. Before he retreated, however, he accepted the invitation of Jonathan to make peace; restored his prisoners and hostages; and promised not again to molest the Jews, a promise which he kept. Jonathan established himself at the fortress of Michmash, so renowned in the history of his great namesake, the son of Saul. There he governed the people, and “destroyed the ungodly men out of Israel.”²³ This state of things lasted for about six years (B.C. 158–153).

The claim of Alexander Balas, a pretended son of Antiochus Epiphanes, to the crown of Syria, led to a new advancement of Jonathan and the Jews (B.C. 153), who were courted by both rivals. Demetrius wrote first, authorizing Jonathan to raise an army, and commanding that the hostages in the tower of Zion should be delivered to him. This was at once done, and Jonathan began to repair the fortifications of Jerusalem. Meanwhile all of the hostile party fled from the fortified cities, except Bethsura. Next came the letter from Alexander, nominating Jonathan to the high-priesthood, which had been vacant since the death of Alcimus, and sending him a

²² B.C. 160–158. 1 Macc. ix. 23–57.

²³ 1 Macc. ix. 58–73.

purple robe and a crown of gold. Jonathan assumed these insignia at the Feast of Tabernacles (B.C. 153), and thus began the line of the priest-princes of the Asmonæan family.* Demetrius, in despair, now made new and unbounded offers: freedom for all the Jews of his kingdom from tribute, from the duties on salt, and from crown-taxes; and exemption from the payment of the third of the seed and the half of the produce of fruit-trees. The three governments of Apherema, Lydda, and Ramathem,** including the port of Ptolemais (*Acre*), were to be taken from Samaria and annexed to Judæa forever, under the sole government of the high-priest. An army of 30,000 Jews was to be raised at the king's expense, to garrison the cities and act as a police. Jerusalem, with its territory, was declared holy, free from tithe and tribute, and a place of asylum. A large annual sum was promised for the works of the temple and the fortifications of the city, and the revenues of Ptolemais were assigned for the ordinary expenses of the sanctuary. All Jewish captives throughout the Syrian empire were to be set free, and all the feasts were to be holidays for them. More moderate offers might have been a better proof of good faith. The Jews had more confidence in Alexander, who was moreover favored by Rome; and, after he had defeated and killed Demetrius (B.C. 150), he gave Jonathan a magnificent reception at Ptolemais, on his marriage with Cleopatra the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor.†

* It does not appear that any direct claimant to the high-priesthood remained since Onias the younger, who inherited the claim of his father Onias, the last legitimate high-priest, had retired to Egypt. A new and glorious succession of high-priests now arose in the Asmonæan family, who united the dignity of civil rulers, and for a time of independent sovereigns, to that of the high-priesthood. Josephus, who is followed by Lightfoot, Selden, and others, calls Judas Maccabæus "high-priest of the nation of Judah" (*Ant.* xii. 10, § 6), but, according to the far better authority of 1 Macc. x. 20, it was not till after the death of Judas Maccabæus that Alcimus himself died, and that Alexander, King of Syria, made Jonathan, the brother of Judas, high-priest. Josephus himself too calls Jonathan "the first of the sons of Asamoneus,

who was high-priest" (*Vita*, § 1). It is possible, however, that Judas may have been elected by the people to the office of high-priest, though never confirmed in it by the Syrian kings. The Asmonæan family were priests of the course of Joarib, the first of the twenty-four courses (1 Chr. xxiv. 7), and whose return from captivity is recorded in 1 Chr. ix. 10; Neh. xi. 10. They were probably of the house of Eleazar, though this can not be affirmed with certainty; and Josephus tells us that he himself was related to them, one of his ancestors having married a daughter of Jonathan, the first high-priest of the house. This Asmonæan dynasty lasted from B.C. 153, till the family was damaged by intestine divisions and then destroyed by Herod the Great.

† Comp. 1 Macc. xi. 34.

‡ 1 Macc. x. 22-66.

Three years later (B.C. 147) the younger Demetrius (who afterward reigned as Demetrius II. Nicator), attempted to recover his father's kingdom; and his adherent Apollonius, governor of Cœlesyria, advanced to Jamnia and sent a challenge to Jonathan. A battle was fought near Azotus, in which the infantry of Jonathan stood firm against the Syrian cavalry, who attacked them on all sides, till the fresh forces of his brother Simon routed the wearied horsemen, who fled to the temple of Dagon at Azotus. Jonathan burned the city and temple, with the men in it to the number of 8000; and after receiving the submission of Ascalon he returned to Jerusalem.²⁸

A new enemy now took the field against Alexander, in the person of his father-in-law, Ptolemy, who marched into Syria, professedly as a friend. Jonathan met him at Joppa, and was favorably received, in spite of the accusations of his enemies. We need not here relate the alliance of Ptolemy with the young Demetrius, nor the defeat and death of Alexander, followed by the death of Ptolemy and the accession of DEMETRIUS II. NICATOR to the throne of Syria (B.C. 146). Jonathan's political tact not only brought him safe through this revolution, but gained new advantages for his country. During the confusion, he had laid siege to the tower on Zion, for which act his enemies accused him to the new king, who summoned him to Ptolemais. Leaving orders to press the siege, he went with a body of priests and elders, carrying splendid presents. He gained great favor with Demetrius, who confirmed him in the high-priesthood; and a present of 300 talents to the king secured for Judæa most of the privileges which had been promised by Demetrius I.

The unpopularity of Demetrius, in consequence of his disbanding the Syrian troops and replacing them by mercenaries whom he had brought with him from Crete, opened the door to the schemes of TRYPHON, who claimed the throne for Antiochus, son of Alexander Balas. Jonathan seized the opportunity to obtain from Demetrius a promise of the evacuation of the long-contested tower, and sent him a body of 3000 Jews, who saved his life in a tumult at Antioch. But the immediate danger was no sooner past, than Demetrius became estranged from Jonathan, and failed to fulfill his promises.²⁹

The defeat of Demetrius by Tryphon placed ANTIOCHUS VI. THEOS on the throne (B.C. 144). Jonathan was confirmed

²⁸ 1 Macc. x. 67-89.

²⁹ 1 Macc. xi. 1-58.

in all his honors, and his brother Simon was made captain-general of the country from the Ladder of Tyre to the borders of Egypt. Gaza and Bethsura were reduced, and Jonathan defeated the partisans of Demetrius near the lake Gennesareth,⁴⁰ and again in the region of Hamath, and advanced as far as Damascus; while Simon secured Ascalon and took Joppa.⁴¹ Having renewed the alliance with Rome, and also, if we may trust our leading authority, with the Lacedæmonians,⁴² Jonathan summoned the elders to fortify the cities of Judæa, to heighten the walls of Jerusalem, and to block out the tower on Zion by a great mound from the city and the temple. They were engaged on this work when Tryphon, who was plotting an usurpation, and regarded Jonathan as his chief obstacle, enticed him to Ptolemais, with a guard of only 1000 men, who were slain, and Jonathan was made prisoner.⁴³

The enemies of the Jews now rose in every quarter; but Simon was acknowledged as leader, and marched to Adida to meet Tryphon, who was advancing to invade Judæa. When Tryphon found with whom he had to do, he opened negotiations. Pretending that Jonathan had been seized for money due to the king, he promised to release him on the payment of 100 talents of silver and the delivery of two of his sons as hostages. Simon expected treachery; but, lest his motives should be mistaken, he accepted the terms. Tryphon verified his fears; and, after being foiled by Simon in all his attempts to advance to Jerusalem and relieve the Syrian garrison, he marched into Gilead, still carrying Jonathan with him, and killed and buried him at Bascama. On his retiring to Antioch, Simon removed the bones of Jonathan to Modin, where he built a stately monument, with seven obelisks for Mattathias, his wife, and their five sons; the whole forming a sea-mark for passing ships.⁴⁴

§ 9. SIMON, surnamed Thassi, the second son of Mattathias, and the last survivor of his brethren, was high-priest from B.C. 143 to B.C. 135. His wisdom and valor had aided Judas and Jonathan through the long contest, which now needed only one last effort to secure its fruits. Tryphon, occupied

⁴⁰ 1 Macc. xi. 54-74.

⁴¹ 1 Macc. xii. 24-34.

⁴² 1 Macc. xii. 1-23. The narrative is too circumstantial, with its actual documents, to be without foundation, unless it be a forged interpolation. But it provokes no small sus-

picion to find the Lacedæmonians acknowledging themselves to be of the stock of Abraham. For a full discussion of this difficult subject, see the *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. SPARTA.

⁴³ 1 Macc. xii. 35-52.

⁴⁴ 1 Macc. xiii. 1-30.

with his own schemes of usurpation, seems to have renounced all attacks upon Judæa, except predatory incursions as he found opportunity. Simon employed himself in restoring the strongholds, and sought the friendship of Demetrius, who granted the independence of Judæa. The first year of Simon became an epoch from which people dated contracts and other instruments.⁴⁶ After taking Gaza, he broke off the last and heaviest link of the Syrian fetters by the reduction, through famine, of the tower of Jerusalem.⁴⁶ It was purified and solemnly entered on the 23d of the second month, Ær. Seleuc. 171 (May, B.C. 142), which was made an annual festival. John, the second son of Simon, was made captain of the host, and was posted at the fortress of Gazara.⁴⁷

Neither the capture of Demetrius by the Parthians, nor the completion of Tryphon's usurpation by the murder of Antiochus Theos, disturbed the peace which Judæa enjoyed under Simon. "Then did they till their ground in peace, and the earth gave her increase, and the trees of the field their fruit. The ancient men sat in all the streets, communing together of good things, and the young men put on glorious and warlike apparel. He provided victuals for the cities, and set in them all manner of munition, so that his honorable name was renowned unto the end of the world. He made peace in the land, and Israel rejoiced with great joy. . . . He beautified the sanctuary, and multiplied the vessels of the temple." While his internal government was just and firm, he opened up a commerce with Europe through the port of Joppa, and renewed the treaties with Rome and Lacedæmon. The letters in favor of the Jews, addressed by the Roman Senate to the states and islands of Greece and Asia Minor, and to the great potentates of Asia, including even the Parthian Arsaces, are a striking evidence of the wide diffusion of the Jewish race.⁴⁸ A lasting memorial of Simon's services and of the gratitude of his country was inscribed on tablets of brass and set up in Mount Zion.⁴⁹

Tryphon's usurpation was at length challenged by ANTI-
OCHUS VII. SIDETES, second son of Demetrius I., and brother
of the captive Demetrius II., who made unbounded promises
to the Jews. He quickly defeated Tryphon, and besieged

⁴⁶ 1 Macc. xiii. 33-42. It was not, however, till the fifth year of his son, John Hyrcanus, that the final recognition of Jewish independence was made by Syria.

⁴⁸ The leveling of the hill on which

the tower had stood, so that it should no longer command the temple, has affected the topography of Jerusalem.

⁴⁷ 1 Macc. xiii. 43-53.

⁴⁸ 1 Macc. xiv. 1-24, xv. 15-24.

⁴⁹ 1 Macc. xiv. 25-49.

him in Dora," whither Simon sent him 2000 men, with abundance of money and arms. But Antiochus, from jealousy of Simon's power and wealth, refused the proffered aid, and sent Athenobius to demand Joppa and Gazara," besides 1000 talents for the places taken and the trib-

⁶⁰ Dora, one of those maritime cities which acquired a peculiar importance in the Maccabæan, Herodian, and Roman periods, was the ancient Dor, a royal city of the Canaanites (Josh. xi. 1, 2, xii. 23, xvii. 11; Judg. i. 27; 1 K. iv. 11). It was probably the most southern settlement of the Phœnicians on the coast of Syria (Jos. Vit. 8; Ant. xv. 9, § 8). Josephus describes it as a maritime city, on the west border of Manasseh and the north border of Dan (Ant. v. 1, § 22, viii. 2, § 3, B. J. i. 7, § 7), near Mount Carmel (c. Ap. ii. 10). One old author tells us that it was founded by Dorus a son of Neptune, while another affirms that it was built by the Phœnicians, because the neighboring rocky shore abounded in the small shell-fish from which they got the purple dye (Steph. B. s. v.; Reland, Pal. p. 739; Judg. i. 27). The original inhabitants were never expelled; but during the prosperous reigns of David and Solomon they were made tributary (Judg. i. 27, 28), and the latter monarch stationed at Dor one of his twelve purveyors (1 K. iv. 11). Tryphon, the murderer of Jonathan Maccabæus and usurper of the throne of Syria, having sought an asylum in Dor, the city was besieged and captured by Antiochus Sidetes, as related in the text (1 Macc. xv. 11). It was subsequently rebuilt by Gabinius, the Roman general, along with Samaria, Ashdod, and other cities of Palestine (Joseph. Ant. xiv. 5, § 3), and it remained an important place during the early years of the Roman rule in Syria.

Of the site of Dor there can be no doubt. The descriptions of Josephus and Jerome are clear and full. The latter places it on the coast, "in the ninth mile from Cæsarea, on the way to Ptolemais" (Onom. s. v. Dora).

Just at the point indicated is the small village of *Tantûra*, probably an Arab corruption of *Dora*, consisting of about thirty houses, wholly constructed of ancient materials. Three hundred yards north are low rocky mounds projecting into the sea, covered with heaps of rubbish, massive foundations, and fragments of columns. The most conspicuous ruin is a section of an old tower, 30 ft. or more in height, which forms the landmark of *Tantûra*. On the south side of the promontory, opposite the village, is a little harbor, partially sheltered by two or three small islands. A spur of Mount Carmel, steep and partially wooded, runs parallel to the coast line, at the distance of about a mile and a half. Between its base and the sandy beach is a rich and beautiful plain—this is possibly the "border," "coast," or "region" of Dor (Josh. xi. 2, xii. 23; 1 K. iv. 11) referred to in Scripture.

⁶¹ Gazara is another place frequently mentioned in the wars of the Maccabees, and of great importance in the operations of both parties. Its first introduction is as a stronghold, in which Timotheus took refuge after his defeat by Judas, and which for four days resisted the efforts of the infuriated Jews (2 Macc. x. 32-36). One of the first steps of Bacchides, after getting possession of Judæa, was to fortify Bethsura and Gazara and the citadel (*ἄκρᾱ*) at Jerusalem (1 Macc. ix. 52); and the same names are mentioned when Simon in his turn recovered the country (xiv. 7, 33, 34, 36, xv. 28). So important was it, that Simon made it the residence of his son John as general-in-chief of the Jewish army (xiii. 53, xvi. 1).

There is every reason to believe that Gazara was the same place as the more ancient GEZER or GAZER. The

ute withheld from Syria. Simon refused, but offered 100 talents as a compensation for Joppa and Gazara; and Antiochus commenced the last war which the Maccabees had to wage with Syria. While the king pursued Tryphon, who had escaped from Dora, his general, Cendebeus, appointed commander of the sea-coast, took up his post at Jamnia, and harassed the Jews with constant attacks.⁶² Simon, being now too old to take the field, sent his two eldest sons, Judas and John, with 20,000 men and some horse, who gained a complete victory over the vast forces of Cendebeus. After this success, it might have been expected that Simon would have died in a peaceful old age; but he was not exempted from the violent end of all his brothers. On a progress through the country with his sons Judas and Mattathias, he arrived at Jericho, where he was received by the governor, Ptolemy the son of Abubus, his own son-in-law, and a man of great wealth. In pursuance of a design to make himself master of Judæa, Ptolemy caused Simon and his two sons to be slain treacherously at a banquet. John, who was at Gazara, warned in time, slew the men who were sent to kill him⁶³ (B.C. 135).

With the death of the last of the sons of Mattathias, we lose the authentic record of the *First Book of Maccabees*, and Josephus becomes almost our only guide. The acts of John Hyrcanus were written in the *Chronicles of his Priesthood*, a work older than the *First Book of Maccabees*.⁶⁴

§ 10. JOHN HYRCANUS, the second son of Simon, under whom he had been commander of the army, succeeded his father in the priesthood and government, which he held for thirty years (B.C. 135–106). He at once went from Gazara to Jerusalem; and after the people had accepted him for their leader, he marched against Jericho. Ptolemy, who held a strong fort near the city, tried to deter him from an assault by savage cruelties to his mother and brothers. They were scourged upon the walls, whence Ptolemy threatened to throw them headlong; and though John's mother exhorted him to disregard their sufferings, the intended effect was produced. John retired; the siege, after being protracted for a year, was

name is the same as that which the LXX. use for Gezer in the Old Testament; and more than this, the indications of the position of both are very much in accordance. As David smote the Philistines from Gibeon to Gezer, so Judas defeats Gorgias at Emmaus, and pursues him to Gazara (1 Macc. iv. 15). Gazara also is constantly mentioned in connection with the sea-coast—Joppa and Jamnia (xv. 28, 35, iv. 15), and with the Philistine plain, Azotus, Adasa, etc. (iv. 15, vii. 45, xiv. 34).
⁶² 1 Macc. xv. ⁶³ 1 Macc. xvi.
⁶⁴ 1 Macc. xv. 24.

abandoned ; and Ptolemy fled to Philadelphia beyond the Jordan, after which we hear of him no more. Meanwhile the army of Antiochus proved too strong for John. He was besieged in Jerusalem, and was compelled by famine to give up the city, on the conditions of dismantling the fortifications and returning to a tributary state (B.C. 133). The moderation of Antiochus on this occasion, and his respect for the Jewish religion, gained him the surname of *Eusebes* (the *Pious*). Hyrcanus was treated by him with favor, and attended him on the expedition which the king made against Parthia ostensibly to release his imprisoned brother Demetrius Nicator (B.C. 128). The death of Antiochus in this campaign gave an opportunity for recovering the independence of Judæa, which was never again subjugated by Syria. The latter monarchy indeed became, till its absorption into the Roman empire (B.C. 65), the victim of such dynastic revolutions, that its history is henceforth as unimportant for us, as it is intricate to follow. The Jews once more entered on a course of conquest, limited indeed, but most gratifying to their pride in the humiliation of their ancient and more recent enemies. After carrying his arms into the region east of Jordan, where he took two cities, Hyrcanus subdued both Idumæa and Samaria, the hatred rivals of Israel before and after the Captivity. The Idumæans were compelled to adopt the Jewish religion, and to receive circumcision ; and the conquest was so complete that the kingdom of Idumæa disappears from history : and yet the unconquerable race of Edom soon proved the inheritance of its forefather's blessing by giving a new dynasty to Judæa. In Samaria, John Hyrcanus completed his triumph by destroying the hated schismatic temple on Mount Gerizim. The sanctuary on Mount Zion thus regained its pre-eminence in the Holy Land, and the Jews once more imposed upon the Samaritans the sacred law, "that Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." The reduction of Samaria was effected by Aristobulus and Antigonus, the sons of John Hyrcanus, in the 26th year of his rule (B.C. 109). The city of Samaria was utterly destroyed, and its site converted into pools of water from its own abundant springs. Most of Galilee submitted to the authority of the high-priest, who again renewed the alliance of his family with Rome. Of his buildings at Jerusalem, the most important was the *Tower of Baris*, at the N.W. corner of the enclosure of the Temple. It was afterward the *Antonia* of Herod.

Thus the Holy Land, under the name of Judæa, was restored to its ancient limits, and the people enjoyed their worship,

under a race of priest-princes, who held their authority in submission to the divine law. But no human affairs ever reached the climax of prosperity without taking the downward turn; and it was taken with frightful rapidity by the successors of John Hyrcanus, who displayed a personal ambition unknown to the pure patriotism of the Maccabees, and were soon engaged in fierce contests for the supreme power. Then began those family murders, which form the most horrid feature of Oriental despotism, and which reached their climax under Herod. One chief source of these evils was the rupture of the religious unity of the nation, by the rise of the opposing sects of the PHARISEES and SADDUCEES, which, springing from a doubtful origin, and from causes long at work, had become established during the government of John Hyrcanus.* Toward the end of his reign, Hyrcanus, provoked by an insult from one of the leading Pharisees, joined the party of the Sadducees, a step which left a heritage of trouble to his successors. "The cause of this rupture," says Dean Milman, "is singularly characteristic of Jewish manners. During a banquet, at which the chiefs of the ruling sect were present, Hyrcanus demanded their judgment on his general conduct and administration of affairs, which he professed to have regulated by the great principle of justice (the *righteousness* which was the watch-word of the Pharisees), and by strict adherence to the tenets of their sect. The Pharisees, with general acclamation, testified their approval of all his proceedings; one voice alone, that of Eleazar, interrupted the general harmony:—'If you are a just man, abandon the high-priesthood, for which you are disqualified by the illegitimacy of your birth.' The mother of Hyrcanus had formerly, it was said, though, according to Josephus, falsely, been taken captive, and thus exposed to the polluting embraces of a heathen master. The indignant Hyrcanus demanded the trial of Eleazar for defamation. By the influence of the Pharisees he was shielded, and escaped with scourging and imprisonment. Hyrcanus, enraged at this unexpected hostility, listened to the representations of Jonathan, a Sadducee, who accused the rival faction of a conspiracy to overawe the sovereign power; and from that time he entirely alienated himself from the Pharisaic councils."

John Hyrcanus died exactly sixty years, or the space of two complete generations, after his grandfather Mattathias (B.C. 106). As he began a new generation of the Maccabæan house

* See Appendix to Book I., SECTS OF THE JEWS.

so was he the first who escaped the violent end to which his father and uncles had succumbed. His death marks the transition from the theocratic commonwealth, under the Maccabæan leaders, to the Asmonæan kingdom, which was established by his son Judas or Aristobulus, whose Greek name is but too significant of the hellenizing character of the new era.

The only two of the first generation of the Maccabæan family, who did not obtain to the leadership of their countrymen like their brothers, yet shared their fate—Eleazar by a noble act of self-devotion, John, apparently the eldest brother, by treachery. The sacrifice of the family was complete; and probably history offers no parallel to the undaunted courage with which such a band dared to face death, one by one, in the maintenance of a holy cause. The result was worthy of the sacrifice. The Maccabees inspired a subject-people with independence; they found a few personal followers, and they left a nation.

X § 11. The great outlines of the Maccabæan contest, which are somewhat hidden in the annals thus briefly epitomized, admit of being traced with fair distinctness, though many points must always remain obscure, from our ignorance of the numbers and distribution of the Jewish population, and of the general condition of the people at the time. The disputed succession to the Syrian throne (B.C. 153) was the political turning-point of the struggle, which may thus be divided into two great periods. During the first period (B.C. 168–153) the patriots maintained their cause with varying success against the whole strength of Syria: during the second (B.C. 153–139), they were courted by rival factions, and their independence was acknowledged from time to time, though pledges given in times of danger were often broken when the danger was over. The paramount importance of Jerusalem is conspicuous throughout the whole war. The loss of the Holy City reduced the patriotic party at once to the condition of mere guerrilla bands, issuing from “the mountains” or “the wilderness,” to make sudden forays on the neighboring towns. This was the first aspect of the war;” and the scene of the early exploits of Judas was the hill-country to the N.E. of Jerusalem, from which he drove the invading armies at the famous battle-fields of Beth-horon and Emmaus (Nicopolis). The occupation of Jerusalem closed the first act of the war (B.C. 166); and after this Judas made rapid attacks on every side—in Idumæa, Ammon, Gilead, Galilee—but he made no

permanent settlement in the countries which he ravaged. Bethsura was fortified as a defense of Jerusalem on the south; but the authority of Judas seems to have been limited to the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem, though the influence of his name extended more widely.⁸⁷ On the death of Judas, the patriots were reduced to as great distress as at their first rising; and as Bacchides held the keys of the "mountain of Ephraim," they were forced to find a refuge in the lowlands near Jericho, and after some slight successes Jonathan was allowed to settle at Michmash undisturbed, though the whole country remained absolutely under the sovereignty of Syria. So far it seemed that little had been gained, when the contest between Alexander Balas and Demetrius I. opened a new period (B.C. 153). Jonathan was empowered to raise troops; the Jewish hostages were restored; many of the fortresses were abandoned; and apparently a definite district was assigned to the government of the high-priest. The former unfruitful conflicts at length produced their full harvest. The defeat at Eleasa, like the Swiss St. Jacob, had shown the worth of men who could face all odds, and no price seemed too great to secure their aid. When the Jewish leaders had once obtained legitimate power, they proved able to maintain it, though their general success was checkered by some reverses. The solid power of the national party was seen by the slight effect which was produced by the treacherous murder of Jonathan. Simon was able at once to occupy his place and carry out his plans. The Syrian garrison was withdrawn from Jerusalem; Joppa was occupied as a sea-port; and "four governments"⁸⁸—probably the central parts of the old kingdom of Judah, with three districts taken from Samaria⁸⁹—were subjected to the sovereign authority of the high-priest.

The war, thus brought to a noble issue, if less famous, is not less glorious than any of those in which a few brave men have successfully maintained the cause of freedom or religion against overpowering might. The answer of Judas to those who counseled retreat⁹⁰ was as true-hearted as that of Leonidas; and the exploits of his followers will bear favorable comparison with those of the Swiss, or the Dutch, or the Americans. It would be easy to point out parallels in Maccabæan history to the noblest traits of patriots and martyrs in other countries; but it may be enough here to claim for the contest the attention which it rarely receives. It seems, in-

⁸⁷ 1 Macc. vii. 50, ἡ γῆ 'Ιούδα. ⁸⁸ τέσσαρες νομοί, 1 Macc. xi. 57, xiii. 37.

⁸⁹ 1 Macc. x. 38, 39.

⁹⁰ 1 Macc. ix. 10.

deed, as if the indifference of classical writers were perpetuated in our own days, though there is no struggle—not even the wars of Joshua or David—which is more profoundly interesting to the Christian student. For it is not only in their victory over external difficulties that the heroism of the Maccabees is conspicuous: their real success was as much imperiled by internal divisions as by foreign force. They had to contend on the one hand against open and subtle attempts to introduce Greek customs, and on the other against an extreme Pharisaic party, which is seen from time to time opposing their counsels.⁶¹ And it was from Judas and those whom he inspired that the old faith received its last development and final impress before the coming of our Lord.

For that view of the Maccabæan war, which regards it only as a civil and not as a religious conflict, is essentially one-sided. If there were no other evidence than the book of Daniel—whatever opinion be held as to the date of it—that alone would show how deeply the noblest hopes of the theocracy were centred in the success of the struggle. When the feelings of the nation were thus again turned with fresh power to their ancient faith, we might expect that there would be a new creative epoch in the national literature; or, if the form of Hebrew composition was already fixed by sacred types, a prophet or psalmist would express the thoughts of the new age after the models of old time.. Yet in part at least the leaders of Maccabæan times felt that they were separated by a real chasm from the times of the kingdom or of the exile. If they looked for a prophet in the future, they acknowledged that the spirit of prophecy was not among them. The volume of the prophetic writings was completed, and, as far as appears, no one ventured to imitate its contents. But the Hagiographa, though they were already long fixed as a definite collection, were not equally far removed from imitation. The apocalyptic visions of Daniel served as a pattern for the visions incorporated in the book of Enoch; and it has been commonly supposed that the Psalter contains compositions of the Maccabæan date. This supposition, which is at variance with the best evidence which can be obtained on the history of the Canon, can only be received upon the clearest internal proof; and it may well be questioned whether the hypothesis is not as much at variance with sound interpretation as with the history of the Canon.⁶²

§ 12. The history of the Maccabees does not contain much

⁶¹ 1 Macc. vii. 12-18. ⁶² See *Old Testament History*, Appendix to Book V.

which illustrates in detail the religious or social progress of the Jews. It is obvious that the period must not only have intensified old beliefs, but also have called out elements which were latent in them. One doctrine at least, that of a resurrection, and even of a material resurrection,⁶⁵ was brought out into the most distinct apprehension by suffering. "It is good to look for the hope from God, to be raised up again by him," was the substance of the martyr's answer to his judge; "as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life."⁶⁶ "Our brethren," says another, "have fallen, having endured a short pain leading to everlasting life, being under the covenant of God."⁶⁷ And as it was believed that an interval elapsed between death and judgment, the dead were supposed to be in some measure still capable of profiting by the intercession of the living. Thus much is certainly expressed in the famous passage, 2 Macc. xii. 43-45, though the secondary notion of a purgatorial state is in no way implied in it. On the other hand it is not very clear how far the future judgment was supposed to extend. If the punishment of the wicked heathen in another life had formed a definite article of belief, it might have been expected to be put forward more prominently,⁶⁸ though the passages in question may be understood of sufferings after death, and not only of earthly sufferings; but for the apostate Jews there was a certain judgment in reserve.⁶⁹ The firm faith in the righteous providence of God shown in the chastening of his people, as contrasted with his neglect of other nations, is another proof of the widening view of the spiritual world, which is characteristic of the epoch.⁷⁰ The lessons of the captivity were reduced to moral teaching; and in the same way the doctrine of the ministry of angels assumed an importance which is without parallel except in patriarchal times. It was perhaps from this cause also that the Messianic hope was limited in its range. The vivid perception of spiritual truths hindered the spread of a hope which had been cherished in a material form; and a pause, as it were, was made, in which men gained new points of sight from which to contemplate the old promises.

The various glimpses of national life which can be gained during the period, show on the whole a steady adherence to the Mosaic law. Probably the law was never more rigor-

⁶⁵ 2 Macc. xiv. 46.

⁶⁶ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν, 2 Macc. vii. 14; comp. vi. 26, xiv. 46.

⁶⁷ 2 Macc. vii. 36, πόνον ἀεννάου ζωῆς

⁶⁸ 2 Macc. vii. 17, 19, 35, etc.

⁶⁹ 2 Macc. vi. 26.

⁷⁰ 2 Macc. iv. 16, 17, v. 17-20, vi 12-16, etc.

ously fulfilled. The importance of the Antiochian persecution in fixing the Canon of the Old Testament deserves notice. The books of the law were specially sought out for destruction;⁶⁹ and their distinctive value was in consequence proportionately increased. To use the words of 1 Macc., "the holy books in our hands" were felt to make all other comfort superfluous.⁷⁰ The strict observance of the Sabbath⁷¹ and of the Sabbatical year,⁷² the law of the Nazarites,⁷³ and the exemptions from military service,⁷⁴ the solemn prayer and fasting,⁷⁵ carry us back to early times. The provision for the maimed, the aged, and the bereaved,⁷⁶ was in the spirit of the law; and the new feast of the dedication was a homage to the old rites,⁷⁷ while it was a proof of independent life. The interruption of the succession to the high-priesthood was the most important innovation which was made, and one which prepared the way for the dissolution of the state. After various arbitrary changes, the office was left vacant for seven years upon the death of Alcimus. The last descendant of Jozadak (Onias), in whose family it had been for nearly four centuries, fled to Egypt, and established a schismatic worship; and at last, when the support of the Jews became important, the Maccabæan leader, Jonathan, of the family of Joarib, was elected to the dignity by the nomination of the Syrian king,⁷⁸ whose will was confirmed, as it appears, by the voice of the people.⁷⁹

Little can be said of the condition of literature and the arts which has not been already anticipated. In common intercourse the Jews used the Aramaic dialect which was established after the return: this was "their own language;"⁸⁰ but it is evident from the narrative quoted that they understood Greek, which must have spread widely through the influence of Syrian officers. There is not, however, the slightest evidence that Greek was employed in Palestinian literature till a much later date. The description of the monument which was erected by Simon at Modin in memory of his family,⁸¹ is the only record of the architecture of the time. The description is obscure, but in some features the structure appears to have presented a resemblance to the tombs of Porsena and

⁶⁹ 1 Macc. i. 56, 57, iii. 48.

⁷⁰ 1 Macc. xii. 9.

⁷¹ 1 Macc. ii. 32; 2 Macc. vi. 11, viii. 26, etc.

⁷² 1 Macc. vi. 53.

⁷³ 1 Macc. iii. 49.

⁷⁴ 1 Macc. iii. 56.

⁷⁵ 1 Macc. iii. 47; 2 Macc. x. 25, etc.

⁷⁶ 2 Macc. viii. 28, 30.

⁷⁷ 2 Macc. i. 9. ⁷⁸ 1 Macc. x. 20.

⁷⁹ Comp. 1 Macc. xiv. 35.

⁸⁰ 2 Macc. vii. 8, 21, 27, xii. 37.

⁸¹ 1 Macc. xiii. 27-30. *Notes, etc.*

(B).

the Curiatii,⁸² and perhaps to one still found in Idumæa. An oblong basement, of which the two chief faces were built of polished white marble,⁸³ supported "seven pyramids in a line ranged one against another," equal in number to the members of the Maccabæan family, including Simon himself. To these he added other works of art (*μηχανήματα*), placing round (on the two chief faces?) great columns (Josephus adds, each of a single block), bearing "trophies of arms, and sculptured ships, which might be visible from the sea below." The language of 1 Macc. and Josephus implies that these columns were placed upon the basement, otherwise it might be supposed that the columns rose only to the height of the basement supporting the trophies on the same level as the pyramids. So much at least is evident, that the characteristics of this work—and probably of later Jewish architecture generally—bore closer affinity to the styles of Asia Minor and Greece than of Egypt or the East; a result which would follow equally from the Syrian dominion and the commerce which Simon opened by the Mediterranean.⁸⁴

The only recognized relics of the time are the coins which bear the name of "Simon," or "Simon Prince (*Nasi*) of Israel," in Samaritan letters. The privilege of a national coinage was granted to Simon by Antiochus VII. Sidetes;⁸⁵ and numerous examples occur which have the dates of the first, second, third, and fourth years of the liberation of Jerusalem (Israel, Zion); and it is a remarkable confirmation of their genuineness, that in the first year the name Zion does not occur, as the citadel was not recovered till the second year of Simon's supremacy, while after the second year Zion alone is found.⁸⁶ The privilege was first definitely accorded in B.C. 140, while the first year of Simon was B.C. 143;⁸⁷ but this discrepancy causes little difficulty, as it is not unlikely that the concession of Antiochus was made in favor of a practice already existing. No date is given later than the fourth year, but coins of Simon occur without a date, which may belong to the last four years of his life. The emblems which the coins bear have generally a connection with Jewish history—a vine-leaf, a cluster of grapes, a vase (of manna?), a trifid flowering rod, a palm-branch surrounded by a wreath of laurel, a lyre,⁸⁸ a bundle of branches symbolic of the feast of tabernacles. The coins issued in the last war of independence by Barcochba

⁸² Plin. *H. N.* xxxvi. 13.

⁸³ Joseph. *Ant.* xiii. 6, § 5.

⁸⁴ 1 Macc. xiv. 5.

⁸⁵ 1 Macc. xv. 6, *κόμμα ἰδίου νόμισμα τῇ χώρᾳ*.

⁸⁶ Bayer, *de Nummis*, 171.

⁸⁷ 1 Macc. xiii. 42. ⁸⁸ *Ib.* xiii. 51.

repeat many of these emblems, and there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing the two series. The authenticity of all the Maccabæan coins was impugned by Tychsen,⁸² but on insufficient grounds. He was answered by Bayer, whose admirable essays⁸³ give the most complete account of the coins, though he reckons some apparently later types as Maccabæan. Eckhel⁸⁴ has given a good account of the controversy, and an accurate description of the chief types of the coins.⁸⁵

The authorities for the Maccabæan history have been given already. Of modern works, that of Ewald is by far the best. Herzfeld has collected a mass of details, chiefly from late sources, which are interesting and sometimes valuable; but the student of the period can not but feel how difficult it is to realize it as a whole. Indeed, it seems that the instinct was true which named it from one chief hero. In this last stage of the history of Israel, as in the first, all life came from the leader; and it is the greatest glory of the Maccabees that, while they found at first all turn upon their personal fortunes, they left a nation strong enough to preserve an independent faith till the typical kingdom gave place to a universal Church.⁸⁶

⁸² *Die Unächtheit d. Jud. Münzen* . . . bewiesen . . . O. G. Tychsen, 1779. ⁸³ Respecting the value of these coins, see the TABLES appended to the *Old Testament History*.

⁸⁴ *De Nummis Hebr. Samaritanis*, Val. Ed. 1781; *Vindiciæ* . . . 1790. ⁸⁵ On the "Books of the Maccabees," see Appendix to Book I., THE


⁸⁶ *Doctr. Numm.* vol. iii. p. 455, ff. APOCRYPHA.



Silver Coin of the Maccabees.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) THE ASMONÆAN FAMILY.



(B.) MODIN AND THE SEPULCHRE OF THE MACCABEES.

This place is not mentioned in either Old or New Testament, though rendered immortal by its connection with the history of the Jews in the interval between the two. It was the native city of the Maccabæan family (1 Macc. xiii. 25), and as a necessary consequence contained their ancestral sepulchre (ii. 70, ix. 19). Mattathias himself, and subsequently his sons Judas and Jona-

than, were buried in the family tomb, and over them Simon erected a structure which is minutely described in the Book of Maccabees (xiii. 25-30), and, with less detail, by Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 6, § 6). (See *below*.)

At Modin the Maccabæan armies encamped on the eve of two of their most memorable victories—that of Judas over Antiochus Eupator (2 Macc. xiii. 14), and that of Simon over Cendebeus (1 Macc. xvi. 4)—the last battle of the veteran chief

before his assassination. The only indication of the position of the place to be gathered from the above notices is contained in the last, from which we may infer that it was near "the plain," i. e., the great maritime lowland of Philistia (ver. 5). By Eusebius and Jerome it is specified as near Diospolis, i. e., Lydda; while the Mishna states that it was 15 (Roman) miles from Jerusalem. At the same time the description of the monument seems to imply (though for this see below) that the spot was so lofty as to be visible from the sea, and so near that even the details of the sculpture were discernible therefrom. All these conditions, excepting the last, are tolerably fulfilled in either of the two sites called *Latrûn* and *Kubâb*. The former of these is, by the shortest road—that through *Wady Ali*—exactly 15 Roman miles from Jerusalem; it is about 8 English miles from *Lydd*, 15 from the Mediterranean, and 9 or 10 from the river *Rubin*, on which it is probable that Cedron—the position of Cendebeus in Simon's battle—stood. *Kubâb* is a couple of miles further from Jerusalem, and therefore nearer to *Lydd* and to the sea, on the most westerly spur of the hills of Benjamin. Both are lofty, and both apparently—*Latrûn* certainly—command a view of the Mediterranean. In favor of *Latrûn* are the extensive ancient remains with which the top of the hill is said to be covered (Rob. B. R. iii. 151), though of their age and particulars we have at present no accurate information. *Kubâb* appears to possess no ruins, but on the other hand

its name may retain a trace of the monument.

The mediæval and modern tradition places Modin at *Soba*, an eminence south of *Kuriet el-enab*; but this being not more than 7 miles from Jerusalem, while it is as much as 25 from *Lydd* and 20 from the sea, and also far removed from the plain of Philistia, is at variance with every one of the conditions implied in the records.

The descriptions of the tomb by the author of the Book of Maccabees and Josephus, who had both apparently seen it, will be most conveniently compared by being printed together.

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>1 Macc. xiii. 27-31.
 "And Simon made a building over the sepulchre of his father and his brethren, and raised it aloft to view with polished stone behind and before. And he set up upon it seven pyramids, one against another, for his father and his mother and his four brethren. And on these he made engines of war, and set great pillars round about, and on the pillars he made suits of armor for a perpetual memory; and by the suits of armor ships carved, so that they might be seen by all that sail on the sea. This sepulchre he made at Modin, and it stands unto this day."</p> | <p>Jos. Ant. xiii. 6, § 6.
 "And Simon built a very large monument to his father and his brethren of white and polished stone. And he raised it up to a great and conspicuous height, and threw cloisters around, and set up pillars of a single stone, a work wonderful to behold: and near to these he built seven pyramids to his parents and his brethren, one for each, terrible to behold both for size and beauty.
 And these things are preserved even to this day."</p> |
|--|--|

The monuments are said by Eusebius (*Onom.*) to have been still shown when he wrote—A.D. circa 320.



Coin of Antiochus VI.

CHAPTER III.

THE ASMONÆAN KINGDOMS. B.C. 106-37.

- § 1. Change for the worse in Jewish history—ARISTOBULUS I. assumes the royal title—Conquest of Ituræa—Deaths of Antigonus and Aristobulus. § 2. ALEXANDER JANNÆUS—Judæa invaded by Ptolemy Lathyrus, and rescued by Cleopatra—Conquests and defeats of Alexander—His civil war, and dying reconciliation with the Pharisees—Honors to his memory. § 3. ALEXANDRA, with Hyrcanus II. as high-priest—Ascendancy of the Pharisees, undermined by a secret opposition. § 4. HYRCANUS II. is deposed by his brother Aristobulus—Defeat of the party of the Pharisees. § 5. ARISTOBULUS II.—Rise of ANTIPATER—Hyrcanus flies to Aretas, King of Arabia, who besieges Jerusalem—The paschal lambs—The prayer of Onias. § 6. Intervention of Rome—The Mithridatic War—Tigranes expelled from Syria by Lucullus—Antiochus XIII. deposed, and Syria made a Roman province—Pompey as arbiter between the Jewish princes—Resistance of Aristobulus—Pompey takes Jerusalem, profanes the Temple, and carries off Aristobulus to Rome. § 7. HYRCANUS II. restored to the high-priesthood—Revolt of Alexander put down by Gabinius—New Constitution—The five Great Sanhedrims—Escape and defeat of Aristobulus and Antigonus—New revolt and defeat of Alexander—Crassus plunders the Temple. § 8. The Great Civil War of Rome—Deaths of Aristobulus and Alexander—Hyrcanus ethnarch and Antipater procurator of Judæa—Family of Antipater—Herod governor of Galilee—His early boldness. § 9. Death of Cæsar—Judæa oppressed by Cassius—Murder of Antipater and revenge of Herod—Unsuccessful risings of the stricter Jews—Herod marries Mariamne, the granddaughter of Hyrcanus, and defeats Antigonus—Mark Antony makes Herod and Phasaël tetrarchs of Palestine—The Parthian Invasion—Flight of Herod—Death of Phasaël and mutilation of Hyrcanus. § 10. Nominal reign of ANTIGONUS—Herod named by the triumvirs King of Judæa—His war with Antigonus—Capture of Jerusalem—Execution of Antigonus—END OF THE ASMONÆAN DYNASTY.

§ 1. No successive pages of history present a more painful contrast, than those recording the liberation of Judæa by the

Maccabees, and its misgovernment by their posterity. In the prosperous reign of John Hyrcanus, we see the seeds of that unholy ambition and religious discord, which broke out immediately upon his death. Hyrcanus had left the civil government by will to his wife;—an example, among many soon to be met with, of the rise of those female influences which have always played an important part in eastern despotisms;—but it was seized, with the high-priesthood, by his eldest son Aristobulus, who imprisoned his mother and starved her to death. ARISTOBULUS I. (B.C. 106–105), assumed the diadem¹ and the title of king, and founded the Asmonæan monarchy, which lasted just 70 years; but the whole period was one of internal dissension, and for nearly its latter half the interference of the Romans made the royalty little more than nominal.

The brief reign of Aristobulus is marked by one important conquest, and a series of domestic tragedies. He subdued Ituræa² (afterward called Auranitis), a district east of Jordan, at the foot of Antilibanus; and the inhabitants submitted to circumcision under the threat of banishment. A dangerous illness compelled him to return, leaving behind his favorite brother Antigonus; his other three brothers having been shut up in prison. Antigonus soon completed the conquest, and came back to Jerusalem. His appearance in arms, to pay his devotions in the Temple, was used by the queen Alexandra and the women of the court to rouse his brother's jealousy. Aristobulus summoned him to come unarmed into his presence, and stationed soldiers in the subterranean passage from the Temple to the tower of Baris with orders to dispatch him if he appeared in arms. Antigonus was drawn into the trap by treacherous messengers, who told him that the king wished to see his splendid armor. The dying king, horror-struck at the crime, vomited blood; the

¹ This word, now used in a vague poetical sense, had a specific meaning among the nations of antiquity. The diadem was a fillet of silk, two inches broad, bound round the head and tied behind, the invention of which is attributed to Liber (Plin. *H. N.* vii. 56, 57). Its color was generally white (Tac. *An.* vi. 37; Sil. Ital. xvi. 241); sometimes, however, it was of blue, like that of Darius, *cærulea fascia albo distincta* (Q. Curt. iii. 3, vi. 20; Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 3, § 13); and it was sown with pearls or

other gems (Gibbon, i. 892; Zech. ix. 16), and enriched with gold (Rev. ix. 7). It was peculiarly the mark of Oriental sovereigns (1 Macc. xiii. 82, τὸ διάδημα τῆς Ἀσίας), and hence the deep offense caused by the attempt of Cæsar to substitute it for the laurel crown appropriated to Roman emperors.

² It derived its name from Jetur, a son of Ishmael, who gave his name, like the rest of his brethren, to the little province he colonized (Gen. xxv. 15, 16)

slave who bore away the basin slipped upon the spot where Antigonus had been killed, and the blood of the two brothers was mingled upon the pavement—too true an emblem of the later history of the Asmonæans. The king compelled his attendants to tell him the cause of the consternation that he saw around him, and, on hearing it, expired in an agony of remorse. He was doubly obnoxious as a Sadducee, and for his leaning to the Greek party, whence he obtained the epithet of Philhellen; and it is possible that his character has been darkened by party hatred. His three brothers were released from prison after his death.

§ 2. ALEXANDER JANNÆUS (B.C. 105-78), the eldest surviving brother of Aristobulus I., secured the succession to the throne and priesthood by putting his next brother to death, on a charge of aspiring to the diadem. The intestine commotions both of Syria and Egypt invited him to reduce the cities of Palestine which had not yet submitted: Ptolemais, Gaza, Dora, and the tower of Straton. On his besieging Ptolemais, the people asked aid from Ptolemy Lathyrus, who was now King of Cyprus, having been driven from the throne of Egypt by his mother, Cleopatra. The large force with which Ptolemy came to their relief excited the fears of the citizens, and they refused to admit him. He marched into Judæa, defeated Alexander's army with great slaughter, and ravaged the country with horrible cruelties. Judæa was rescued by an army which Cleopatra sent to its aid under two Alexandrian Jews, Chelchias and Ananias;¹ and the queen, resisting the advice of her counselors to seize the country, was content with the capture of Ptolemais. When the foreign armies had retired, Alexander took Gadara, east of Jordan, but was defeated before Amathus. He next laid siege to Gaza, and after a desperate struggle took and utterly destroyed the city.

Meanwhile the Jewish factions were tending rapidly to civil war. The Pharisees incited a tumult against Alexander. As he was officiating at the Feast of Tabernacles, the people pelted him with citrons, and revived the insults upon his father's birth. Alexander called in his guards, and 6000 of the people were killed. To prevent the recurrence of such tumults, the court of the priests was railed off from the outer court of the temple, and Alexander enrolled a body-guard of Pisidian and Cilician mercenaries. He then resumed

¹ The influence acquired by the Jews in Egypt is further proved by the circumstance, that Ananias succeeded in dissuading Cleopatra from seizing Alexander when he came to offer his congratulations at Ptolemais.

his projects of conquest, and subdued Gilead and Moab. Three years later he had advanced against Gaulonitis, a district in the north of Batanea, when he was defeated, with the total loss of his army, by the Arabian king, Orodes.

The whole Jewish nation now rose in rebellion, and a civil war ensued for six years. Alexander's mercenaries at first gave him the upper hand; but, when he asked the people on what terms they would submit, they called out to him to cut his throat. At length, by the aid of Demetrius Eucærus, one of the rival kings of Syria, Alexander was defeated, and his mercenaries cut to pieces, he himself flying to the mountains. By an unexplained reaction of public feeling, he soon recovered all he had lost; and, having finished the civil war by the capture of Bethsura, he brought his prisoners in triumph to Jerusalem. Then was seen the incredible spectacle of a high-priest, the great-grandson of Simon the Maccabee, sitting at a banquet with his wives and concubines, to gloat his eyes upon the crucifixion of 800 of his enemies and the massacre of their wives and children. The nickname of "Thracian" expressed the impotence of public indignation; his opponents fled the country, to the number of 8000; and the remainder of his reign was undisturbed by open revolt.

Alexander spent some years in extending his dominions to the east of Jordan, and defending them against the Syrians and Arabians. He died of an ague at the siege of Ragaba, after advising his wife to convene the leaders of the Pharisees, and, having placed his dead body at their disposal, to offer to govern by their counsels. This last propitiation of his inveterate enemies was entirely successful. Alexander's remains were honored with a splendid funeral: his widow succeeded to the civil government, and his eldest son, Hyrcanus, to the high-priesthood.*

§ 3. ALEXANDRA (B.C. 78-69) gave up all real power to the Pharisees, who recalled the exiles of their own party, and demanded justice on those who had advised the crucifixion of the 800 rebels. But a strong opposition was organized under Aristobulus, the younger son of Alexander, secretly favored by his mother. She sent the accused persons to garrison some of the frontier towns, and dispatched Aristobulus on a secret expedition against Damascus, in which his success gained him the favor of the army.

* Amid the general silence of the classical authors, it is interesting to find Strabo speaking of Judæa as of a priest, assumed the state of a now "openly governed by tyranny," king" (xvi. p. 762).

§ 4. The result was seen when Alexandra, dying at the age of 73, was succeeded nominally by HYRCANUS II., who already held the high-priesthood (B.C. 69). Aristobulus fled from Jerusalem before his mother breathed her last; and, collecting an army from the garrisons, he defeated the forces of the Pharisees at Jericho, and advanced upon Jerusalem. Hyrcanus took refuge in the tower of Baris, which he surrendered after a short siege, yielding the civil and pontifical crowns to his brother, who permitted him to retire into private life.

§ 5. ARISTOBULUS II. (B.C. 69-63) had scarcely achieved his victory over the Pharisees, when a new enemy arose in the person of ANTIPATER, whose son Herod was destined to raise a new throne on the ruins of the Asmonæan dynasty. Antipater was by birth an Idumæan noble, the son of Antipas, who had been governor of Idumæa under Alexander Jannæus. Brought up at the royal court, he embraced Judaism, at least in name, and became the bosom friend of Hyrcanus, whose feeble mind he now easily bent to his own ambitious schemes. Persuading him that his life was in danger from his brother, Antipater induced Hyrcanus to fly to ARETAS, king of the Nabathæans of Arabia Petræa, a new power which had been growing up around the rock-hewn city of Petra.* They soon returned with an army of 50,000 men under Aretas, who defeated Aristobulus, and besieged him in the Temple, his last refuge. The passover came round, and the besieged had no lambs to offer. We have seen a Syrian king, Antiochus Sidetes, furnishing victims during a former siege; but the allies, though partisans of a high-priest, mocked the besieged by promising to supply them, if they would let down baskets over the wall with the price of the victims, and then, taking the money, they left the baskets to be drawn up empty, or placed in them swine instead of the lambs.

Another striking incident of the siege relieves the monotonous story of these civil discords. Onias, an aged man in the camp of Hyrcanus, was required to offer his prayers, which had proved effectual during a great drought; and he besought God, since His people were on one side and His priests on the other, not to hear the prayers of either for each other's hurt. For this impartial patriotism he was stoned to death.

§ 6. Amid such scenes it was time for the appearance of that stern arbiter—the *Iron* state of Nebuchadnezzar's vis-

* Respecting the origin and history of this people, see the *Dict. of Bible*, art. NEBAIOTH.

ion—to which Providence had assigned the work of crushing the effete despotisms of Asia, and reducing the civilized world under one government, in preparation for the coming of the Christ. ROME, though never wanting a pretext for interference with other states, might plead her alliance of a century old with the Asmonæan princes as making her intervention a duty. Her supremacy in Western Asia had long been disputed and imperiled by Mithridates,⁶ whose son-in-law, Tigranes, king of Armenia, had seized Syria in B.C. 83, and remained master of the country, till Lucullus defeated Tigranes, and restored the last of the Seleucidæ, Antiochus XIII., in the first year of Aristobulus, B.C. 69. Three years later the conduct of the Mithridatic war was committed to the famous Pompey; and while he defeated Mithridates, and plunged in pursuit of him into the regions south of Mount Caucasus, his lieutenant Scaurus was sent to take possession of Damascus and settle the affairs of Syria. After deposing Antiochus XIII. and conquering Syria for Rome (B.C. 65), Scaurus received at Damascus the envoys of Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, who now occupied the positions in which we left them at Jerusalem. Both offered the large bribes of 400 talents, and Scaurus decided in favor of Aristobulus, who was master of the treasures in the Temple (B.C. 64).

Aretas retired at the Roman's command; and Aristobulus, falling on his rear, gave him a signal defeat. The same year, Pompey himself, having reduced Cœlesyria, appeared at Damascus to receive the homage and presents of the neighboring kings. Aristobulus sent him a golden vine, worth 500 talents; but Pompey took care to hold the balance in suspense between the prince who had possession of Jerusalem and his feeble rival. He returned to Syria, and came again in the following spring to Damascus, to hold a formal court for deciding, not only between the two brothers, but between them and the Jewish people, who now ventured to complain of the hierarchical kingdom as a usurpation. Hyrcanus was represented by the wily Antipater, who had taken care to enforce his argument from the right of the elder brother by bribing more than a thousand of the most distinguished Jews to appear before the tribunal as his adherents. In contrast with this venerable band, there appeared on the part of Aristobulus "a troop of insolent youths, splendidly arrayed in purple, with flowing hair and rich armor, who carried themselves as if they were the true nobles of the land." (Milman.)

⁶ The story of the Mithridatic Wars belongs to the history of Rome.

The orators of his party pleaded that the imbecility of Hyrcanus rendered him unfit to govern. The Roman behaved to both with that cold and ambiguous reserve, which Cicero has drawn as a leading trait of his character, and while studiously courteous to Aristobulus, he left reason to suspect that his decision would be in favor of Hyrcanus, whose incapacity was sure to give a pretext for converting protection into conquest. From some such fear, or from the consciousness of a bad cause, Aristobulus no sooner saw the departure of Pompey on an expedition to secure the rock-hewn city of Petra, the great trading capital of the Arabs, than he began to prepare for resistance. The rapid return of Pompey disconcerted his plans; and Aristobulus, unable to disobey the mandate to come forth from the stronghold of Alexandrion, was compelled to sign orders for the surrender of all his fortresses. The restless prince still tried the last resource of fleeing to Jerusalem and attempting to defend the city. The Roman legions advanced along the high-road from the East through Jericho, where Pompey's admiration was excited by the palm-groves that gave name to the city, and the odoriferous shrubs which yielded its far-famed balsams. Once more Aristobulus came forward to offer the surrender of Jerusalem; and he was detained while Pompey sent forward his legate, Gabinus, to take possession of the city. On its unexpected resistance, Pompey threw Aristobulus into chains, and advanced with his whole army. He was admitted by the party of Hyrcanus, who had now gained the upper hand. The friends of Aristobulus shut themselves up in the Temple, which held out for three months, and was at last taken by assault, with the slaughter of 12,000 Jews. The priests, who were engaged about the daily sacrifices, calmly continued their service, and many of them were slain at the altar. The Temple was profaned by the entrance of the Roman general, the images on whose standards had long ago been indicated by Daniel's prophecy of "the abomination that maketh desolate" (B.C. 63): but, as on former occasions, a long respite, filled with golden opportunities, followed the first step of the threatened judgment, before the desolation was completed. Pompey entered the Holy of Holies, where he was amazed to find no statue or other symbol of the Deity. He left the sacred vessels and the vast treasures untouched,⁷ and ordered

⁷ It excites natural surprise to find millions sterling. The explanation the Temple, at this stage of Jewish history, still in possession of treasures which have been computed at two of the Roman empire, of which we

the Temple to be purified. He conferred the high-priesthood and principality upon Hyrcanus, limiting his territory to Judæa Proper, and forbidding him to assume the crown. He imposed a tribute, and demolished the walls of Jerusalem. Aristobulus was carried off, with his two sons and two daughters, to grace the victor's triumph; but Alexander, the elder son, escaped on the way; and Antigonus, the younger, as well as Aristobulus himself, made their escape from Rome at a later period. Meanwhile, the Jews regarded Pompey's sacrilege as the fatal turning-point of his history; and when the civil war broke out, they warmly embraced the party of Cæsar.

§ 7. HYRCANUS II. (B.C. 63–40) was restored to a power which was merely nominal; for Judæa was really governed by Antipater in complete subservience to the policy of Rome. In fact, Judæa seems to have been annexed by Pompey to the newly-formed province of Syria, though under a separate administration, both judicial and financial. The progress of Alexander, who soon appeared at the head of 10,000 foot and 1500 horse, left Hyrcanus no choice but Roman protection. Gabinius, the proconsul of Syria, besieged Alexander in the fortress of Alexandrion; but the interest of Alexander's mother with the Romans obtained her son an amnesty, on condition of his surrendering that and his other fortresses. The celebrated MARK ANTONY acted in this campaign as the lieutenant of Gabinius. The intervention of Gabinius led to a new settlement of the civil government. He deprived the high-priest of the supreme power, which he divided among five "Great Sanhedrims," seated at Jerusalem, Jericho, Gadara, Amantus, and Sepphoris, and modeled on the Great Sanhedrim of 71 members, which had administered justice at Jerusalem from the time of the Maccabees.^a Thus the desire of the Jews for emancipation from the temporal power of the high-priest was gratified at the expense of the loss of a central seat of government. This state of things lasted till the restoration of Hyrcanus to the principality by Julius Cæsar, B.C. 44.

have an incidental notice in Cicero's praise of Flaccus for forbidding the export of such offerings from the province of Asia. "This very remarkable passage," says Dr. Milman, "shows, curiously enough, the Jews as already exporters of gold, though but religious offerings, yet affecting the markets of the world; their great numbers, and clamor in the public

assemblies in the cities of Asia Minor; the astonishment that Pompey had the moderation, for which Cicero is perplexed to account, not to plunder the Temple, and was unwilling to expose himself to the reproaches of a people so likely to be heard as the Jews."

^a See *Notes and Illustrations* (A), THE SANHEDRIM.

The new settlement was but just made, when Aristobulus, having escaped from Rome with his youngest son Antigonus, gathered a new army, and again occupied Alexandria; but they were speedily defeated by Gabinius, and sent back to Rome, where Aristobulus remained a prisoner, but Antigonus was again released through his mother's intercession. When Gabinius marched with Mark Antony into Egypt, Alexander seized the opportunity for another revolt, and shut up the small Roman force, who had been left behind, in Mount Gerizim (B.C. 56). At the head of 80,000 men he met Gabinius after his return from Egypt, but was utterly defeated near Mount Tabor, and only saved his life by flight.

In B.C. 55 CRASSUS received Syria as his share in the partition of provinces by the first triumvirs. In the following year he reached Jerusalem on his disastrous expedition against the Parthians, who had complete power beyond the Euphrates, and had begun to threaten Syria. The high-priest only whetted his insatiable avarice by the surrender of a secret treasure; and Crassus pillaged the temple of all the wealth which was collected by the annual offerings of the faithful who were dispersed over the world, and which Pompey had spared. His plunder is said to have reached the enormous amount of 10,000 talents, or more than two millions sterling; and his fatal overthrow by the Parthians was viewed by the Jews as the punishment of one more of their oppressors, for Gabinius had already been driven into exile.

§ 8. On the outbreak of the Civil War, Cæsar freed Aristobulus and sent him to Judæa, but he was murdered on the journey by the partisans of Pompey, and his son Alexander was executed by Scipio at Antioch. Antigonus alone was left; and his claims were superseded by the timely aid which Antipater gave Cæsar in his Egyptian campaign (B.C. 48). His services were rewarded by the restoration of his puppet Hyrcanus to the sovereignty, with the title of Ethnarch, and by the remission of tribute in the Sabbatic year. ANTIPATER was made the Procurator of all Judæa, and a Roman citizen; and the aggrandizement of his family occupies the few remaining years of the Asmonæan dynasty.

Antipater had four sons:—Phasaël, HEROD, Joseph, and Pheroras, and a daughter named Salome.⁹ He made Phasaël governor of Jerusalem, and Herod, who was only fifteen years old, governor of Galilee. HEROD¹⁰ soon distinguished him-

⁹ See the Genealogical Table in the *Notes and Illustrations* (B). Greek name, like nearly all those of the leaders at this period. His mother was Cyprus, an Arabian princess.

¹⁰ Properly Herodes (Ἡρώδης), a

self alike by energy in his government and defiance of all Jewish laws and powers. He put down the banditti by a severity in which we see the germs of his later cruelties. His execution of their leader roused the jealousy of the Sanhedrim, who cited him to answer before them for his assumption of the power of life and death. Confident in the popularity his success had earned, and bearing a menacing letter from Sextus Cæsar, the governor of Syria, Herod appeared before the Sanhedrim in arms and royal purple. The only man who dared to rebuke his presumption and to warn the court against submission, Sameas, was one of the only two whose lives Herod spared when the warning was fulfilled. Hyrcanus adjourned the trial, and permitted Herod to escape to Damascus to Sextus Cæsar, who made him governor of Cœlesyria. It required all the influence of Antipater to dissuade his son from marching in arms upon Jerusalem.

§ 9. The death of Julius Cæsar (B.C. 44) was a great blow, not only to the party of Hyrcanus and the family of Antipater, but to the whole Jewish nation, to whom he had granted protection in their religion.¹¹ Cassius assumed the government of Syria with the intolerant rapacity of a proconsul of the old school. Judæa was assessed at 700 talents, half to be raised by Antipater and his sons, and half by Malichus, a courtier of Hyrcanus. Malichus being unable to raise his portion, would have fallen a victim to the resentment of Cassius,¹² had not Antipater made good the deficiency from the treasures of Hyrcanus. Malichus acquitted the obligation by poisoning Antipater; but Herod not long afterward procured the murder of Malichus in the presence of Hyrcanus, who was forced to approve the deed as performed by the authority of Cassius, whose favor Herod had completely won.

The departure of Cassius from Syria seemed to give the stricter Jews the opportunity of throwing off the domination of the Herodians, for so we may call the party since the death of Antipater. But Phasaël put them down at Jerusalem, and Antigonus himself was repulsed from Galilee by Herod. Their hopes revived with the battle of Philippi (B.C. 42); and Hyrcanus placed himself at their head. He was won back,

¹¹ Josephus (*Ant.* xiv. 10) quotes edicts of Cæsar and the Senate, granting to Hyrcanus the city of Joppa, and to the people the enjoyment of the Sabbath and the Sabbatic year; an interesting proof, among others, of the adherence of the later Jews,

amid all their civil dissensions, to the rites which had been neglected before the Captivity.

¹² This great "liberator" of his country sold the people of several defaulting villages into slavery.

however, by Herod, who offered to marry his granddaughter Mariamne,¹³ and so allied himself to the Asmonæan family. Herod also defeated Antigonus, though supported by the Roman governor of Damascus; and his presents and flattery secured the favor of Mark Antony, to whom the second triumvirate had given the dominion of the East. Antony committed the two governments of Palestine to Herod and his brother Phasaël, under the title of tetrarchs, and issued various decrees in favor of Hyrcanus and the Jewish nation (B.C. 41).

A last ray of hope from the East gilded the fall of the Asmonæans. While Antony was spending his time in dalliance with Cleopatra, Syria revolted, and called in the aid of the Parthians under Pacorus, the king's son (B.C. 40). Antigonus, the surviving son of Aristobulus, offered the Parthian general 1000 talents and 500 women of the noblest families, if he would restore him to the throne. Supported by a Parthian force, Antigonus marched upon Jerusalem, where the two factions came to open war, and Hyrcanus was only upheld by Herod's energy and severity. At length Hyrcanus and Phasaël were induced, against the advice of Herod, to submit their cause in person to Barzaphernes, the Parthian commander in Syria. Herod fled to Massada, a strong fortress on the west side of the Dead Sea, where he placed his mother, his sister, and his betrothed bride, Mariamne, under the care of his brother Joseph and an Idumæan force, while he betook himself to Rome. Foiled in the main object of securing Herod's person, the Parthian general threw Hyrcanus and Phasaël into chains. The latter committed suicide in prison. The former was mutilated of his ears, in order to disqualify him from continuing high-priest. He lived for some years longer, and was at last put to death by Herod on a charge of treason.

§ 10. ANTIGONUS, the last ruler of the Asmonæan house, held a nominal sovereignty for three years (B.C. 40-37). The Parthians ravaged the country, and Herod soon returned in a new character. He had artfully advocated with the triumvirs the claims of young Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne, who was the grandson both of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus.¹⁴

¹³ She was the daughter of Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, and of Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus, and so the last representative (except Antigonus and her brother Aristobulus) of both the surviving branches of the Asmonæan house. By the marriage, which took place

in B.C. 37, the same year in which Antigonus was put to death, Herod adopted her claims as his own.

¹⁴ His father was Alexander, the elder son of Aristobulus, and his mother was Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus.

But his real wishes were doubtless well known to his former friend, Antony; with his usual address he secured the favor of Octavian; and the result was a decree of the Senate appointing him king of Judæa.

All this was done at Rome in the short space of a week, and Herod landed at Ptolemais after an absence of only three months. Antigonus was now left to himself, his Parthian allies having retired on the advance of Ventidius, the legate of Antony. He was besieging Massada, which Herod speedily relieved with the aid of a Roman force under Silo. The treachery of this general, whose object was to make all the gain he could of both parties, compelled Herod, after considerable successes, to retire from before Jerusalem. Fixing his head-quarters in Samaria, he employed his energies in clearing Galilee of robbers. The next year's campaign was indecisive; but, after the expulsion of the Parthians from Syria, Antony placed a sufficient force at Herod's disposal. Having gained a great battle over Pappus, the general of Antigonus, Herod formed the siege of Jerusalem in the spring of B.C. 37; while he sought to recommend himself to the Asmonæan party by completing his marriage with Mariamne. The siege lasted six months; the sufferings of the besieged being increased by the scarcity of a Sabbatic year. The city was at length taken on a Sabbath;¹ and such was the fury of the Roman soldiery under Sosius, that Herod had to entreat that he might not be left king of a depopulated capital. Antigonus was sent in chains to Antony, who put him to death at Herod's instigation. The last king of the Maccabæan line was the first sovereign who ended his life beneath the rods and axe of the Roman lictor; and the Jewish historian so far sympathizes with Rome, as to forget the shame of his nation in contempt for the weakness of its last native ruler. Thus ended the Asmonæan dynasty (B.C. 37), in the 130th year from the first victories of Judas Maccabæus, and the 70th from the assumption of the royal title by Aristobulus I. We shall soon see how the sole remaining scion of the long line of heroes, priests, and princes, the young Aristobulus, was cut off by Herod.

¹The "Day of Saturn," Dion Cass. *xlvi.* 22.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) THE SANHEDRIM.

THE word Sanhedrim, properly Sanhedrin, is formed from *συνίδριον*: the attempts of the Rabbins to find a Hebrew etymology for it are idle.

The Great Sanhedrim, as it is called in the Talmud, was the supreme council of the Jewish people in the time of Christ and earlier. In the Mishna it is also styled *house of judgment*.

The *origin* of this assembly is traced in the Mishna to the seventy elders whom Moses was directed to associate with him in the government of the Israelites (Num. xi. 16, 17). This body continued to exist, according to the Rabbinical accounts, down to the close of the Jewish commonwealth. But it is now generally admitted that the tribunal established by Moses was probably temporary, and did not continue to exist after the Israelites had entered Palestine.

In the lack of definite historical information as to the establishment of the Sanhedrim, it can only be said in general that the Greek etymology of the name seems to point to a period subsequent to the Macedonian supremacy in Palestine. The fact that Herod, when procurator of Galilee, was summoned before the Sanhedrim (B. C. 47), on the ground that in putting men to death he had usurped the authority of the body (Joseph. *Ant.* xiv. 9, § 4), shows that it then possessed much power and was not of very recent origin. If

the *γεπουσία τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, in 2 Macc. i. 10, iv. 44, xi. 27, designates the Sanhedrim—as it probably does—this is the earliest historical trace of its existence.

In the silence of Philo, Josephus, and the Mishna respecting the *constitution* of the Sanhedrim, we are obliged to depend upon the few incidental notices in the New Testament. From these we gather that it consisted of *ἀρχιερεῖς*, *chief priests*, or the heads of the twenty-four classes into which the priests were divided (including, probably, those who had been high-priests), *πρεσβύτεροι*, *elders*, men of age and experience, and *γραμματεῖς*, *scribes*, lawyers, or those learned in the Jewish law (Matt. xx. 57, 59; Mark xv. 1; Luke xxii. 66; Acts v. 21).

The number of members is usually given as 71, though other authorities make them 70, and others 72. The president of this body was styled *Nasi*, and was chosen on account of his eminence in worth and wisdom. Often, if not generally, this pre-eminence was accorded to the high-priest. That the high-priest presided at the condemnation of Jesus (Matt. xxvi. 62) is plain from the narrative. The vice-president, called in the Talmud *father of the house of judgment*, sat at the right hand of the president. While in session the Sanhedrim sat in the form of a half-circle. In Matt. xxvi. 58, Mark xiv. 54, *al.*, the lictors or attendants of the Sanhedrim are referred to under the name of *ὑπηρέται*.

The *place* in which the sessions of the Sanhedrim were ordinarily held was, according to the Talmud, a hall called *Gazzith*, supposed to have been situated in the south-east corner of one of the courts near the Temple building. In special exigencies, however, it seems to have met in the residence of the high-priest (Matt. xxvi. 3). Forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and consequently while the Saviour was teaching in Palestine, the sessions of the Sanhedrim were removed from the hall *Gazzith* to a somewhat greater distance from the temple building, although still on Mount Moriah. After several other changes, its seat was finally established at Tiberias.

As a judicial body the Sanhedrim constituted a supreme court, to which belonged in the first instance the trial of a tribe fallen into idolatry, false prophets, and the high-priest, as well as the other priests. As an administrative council, it determined other important matters. Jesus was arraigned before this body as a false prophet (John xi. 47), and Peter, John, Stephen, and Paul as teachers

of error and deceivers of the people. From Acts ix. 2, it appears that the Sanhedrim exercised a degree of authority beyond the limits of Palestine. According to the Jerusalem Gemara, the power of inflicting capital punishment was taken away from this tribunal forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem. With this agrees the answer of the Jews to Pilate (John xix. 31), "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death." Beyond the arrest, trial, and condemnation of one convicted of violating the ecclesiastical law, the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim at the time could not be extended; the confirmation and execution of the sentence in capital cases belonged to the Roman procurator. The stoning of Stephen (Acts vii. 56 sqq.) is only an apparent exception, for it was either a tumultuous procedure, or, if done by order of the Sanhedrim, was an illegal assumption of power, as Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 9, 1) expressly declares the execution of the Apostle James during the absence of the procurator to have been.

already seen in the hierarchy which grew up after the Return, found an unexpected embodiment in the tyranny of a foreign usurper. Religion was adopted as a policy; and the hellenizing designs of Antiochus Epiphanes were carried out, at least in their spirit, by men who professed to observe the Law. Side by side with the spiritual "kingdom of God," proclaimed by John the Baptist, and founded by the Lord, a kingdom of the world was established, which in its external splendor recalled the traditional magnificence of Solomon. The simultaneous realization of the two principles, national and spiritual, which had long variously influenced the Jews in the establishment of a dynasty and a church, is a fact pregnant with instruction. In the fullness of time a descendant of Esau established a false counterpart of the promised glories of Messiah.

Various accounts are given of the ancestry of the Herods; but, neglecting the exaggerated statements of friends and enemies,¹ it seems certain that they were of Idumæan descent, a fact which is indicated by the forms of some of the names which were retained in the family. But though aliens by race, the Herods were Jews in faith. The Idumæans had been conquered and brought over to Judaism by John Hyrcanus (B.C. 130); and from the time of their conversion they remained constant to their new religion, looking upon Jerusalem as their mother city, and claiming for themselves the name of Jews.²

The general policy of the whole Herodian family, though modified by the personal characteristics of the successive rulers, was the same. It centred in the endeavor to found a great and independent kingdom, in which the power of Judaism should subserve the consolidation of a state. The protection of Rome was in the first instance a necessity; but the designs of Herod I. and Agrippa I. point to an independ-

¹ The Jewish partisans of Herod (Nicolas Damascenus, *ap.* Joseph. *Ant.* xiv. 1, 3) sought to raise him to the dignity of a descent from one of the noble families which returned from Babylon; and, on the other hand, early Christian writers represented his origin as utterly mean and servile. Africanus has preserved a tradition (Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* ii. p. 285), on the authority of "the natural kinsmen of the Saviour," which makes Antipater the father of Herod,

the son of one Herod, a slave attached to the service of a temple of Apollo at Ascalon, who was taken prisoner by Idumæan robbers, and kept by them, as his father could not pay his ransom. The locality (cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, § 30) no less than the office was calculated to fix a heavy reproach upon the name (cf. Routh, *ad loc.*). This story is repeated with great inaccuracy by Epiphanius (*Hær.* xx.).

² Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 7, § 7; *B. J.* i. 10, § 4, iv. 4, § 4.

ent Eastern Empire as their end, and not to a mere subject monarchy. Such a consummation of the Jewish hopes seems to have found some measure of acceptance at first, and hence arose the party of the *Herodians*;³ and by a natural reaction the temporal dominion of the Herods opened the way to the destruction of the Jewish nationality. The religion which was degraded into the instrument of unscrupulous ambition lost its power to quicken a united people. The high-priests were appointed and deposed by Herod I. and his successors with such a reckless disregard for the character of their office, that the office itself was deprived of its sacred dignity.⁴ The nation was divided, and amid the conflicts of sects a universal faith arose, which more than fulfilled the nobler hopes that found no satisfaction in the treacherous grandeur of a court.

HEROD THE GREAT⁵ (B.C. 37-4) was now established on the throne of Judæa, and founded a dynasty of princes who ruled in different parts of Palestine under various titles; but among whom he himself was the last, as he was the first, independent sovereign of the whole country. For he may be termed independent in reference to the exercise of his power, though its origin and tenure rested on the will of his Roman masters. By birth an Idumæan, by policy and predilection an adherent and imitator of Rome, he seemed to many of his subjects little better than a heathen conqueror; and his cruelties to the Asmonæan house, which was still held in reverence, roused a deep sense of indignation. He signalized his elevation to the throne by offerings to the Capitoline Jupiter, and surrounded his person with foreign mercenaries, some of whom had been formerly in the service of Cleopatra. His coins, and those of his successors, bore only Greek legends, and he introduced heathen games within the walls of Jerusalem. He resolved at once to show the malcontents that they had a master. Massacre and confiscation were dealt out to the Asmonæan party. Forty-five of the chief adherents of Antigonus were put to death, with the whole Sanhedrim, except the rabbis Sameas and Pollio,⁶ who had counseled the surrender of Jerusalem during the siege. Their spoils enabled Herod to satisfy the rapacity of his patron Antony. The whole period of Herod's reign was, in many respects, a

³ *Notes and Illustrations* (A).

⁴ See Acts xxiii. 2 fol.

⁵ Ewald observes that Herod is not called the *Great* in any contemporary document. There are inscriptions which style him "the Great King,"

but this is a title of royalty, not the appellation of the man.

⁶ The Jewish names of these two great rabbis were Shemaiah and Abtalion. They were the sons of proselytes.

repetition of that of the Maccabees and Antiochus Epiphanes. True, Herod was more politic and more prudent, and also probably had more sympathy with the Jewish character, than Antiochus. But the spirit of stern resistance to innovation and of devotion to the law of Jehovah burned no less fiercely in the breasts of the people than it had done before; and it is curious to remark how every attempt on Herod's part to introduce foreign customs was met by outbreaks, and how futile were all the benefits which he conferred both on the temporal and ecclesiastical welfare of the people when these obnoxious intrusions were in question. Whatever his ultimate designs might be, he was not yet prepared to annul the great institutions of religion; nor, as a stranger of the hated race of Esau, did he venture to assume the robes of Aaron. He brought an obscure priest from Babylon, named Ananel, to fill the office of high-priest, which had been vacant since the mutilation of Hyrcanus. But this insult to the surviving members of the Asmonæan house found an able and unscrupulous opponent. This was Alexandra, the daughter of Hyrcanus, widow of Alexander the elder son of Aristobulus, and mother of Herod's wife Mariamne, and of young Aristobulus, whose claims we have seen Herod himself affecting to support at Rome. Her adroit appeals to Cleopatra, and her unscrupulous intrigues to win over Antony, alarmed Herod, who, always ready to trim his policy by necessity, conferred the high-priesthood on Aristobulus. But the people's applause, when they saw the graceful youth of sixteen, the last scion of the Maccabees, perform his office with a dignity becoming his descent, sealed the doom which had doubtless already been resolved on. At a feast given by Alexandra to Herod near Jericho, Aristobulus was drowned while bathing in a tank, as if accidentally, by the rough play of his comrades, who were instigated by Herod. Ananel was then reappointed to the priesthood.

It was in vain that the king honored his victim with a splendid funeral. The people were not deceived by his pretended grief; and Alexandra again appealed to Cleopatra. Herod was summoned to Antony at Laodicea. He resolved to face the danger; but, the husband's jealousy being perhaps mixed with the desire for a sweet revenge on Alexandra in the death of her remaining child, he left orders with his brother Joseph to dispatch Mariamne on the first news of his own death. Herod's gifts and personal influence with Antony triumphed even over the enmity of Cleopatra; but the visit had fatal consequences. Herod returned, with Cœlesyria

added to his dominions, to have his mind poisoned against his wife by the jealousy of his sister Salome. His fondness for Mariamne, however, prevailed over suspicion, till her own remonstrance with him for the cruel sentence, which Joseph had betrayed to her, seemed to prove the familiarity alleged by Salome. But her charms had not yet lost their power, and his rage was satiated by the execution of Joseph and the imprisonment of Alexandra. A new danger followed, in the shape of a visit of Cleopatra to Jerusalem, on her return with Antony from his Parthian expedition; but Herod, after saving his kingdom from her cupidity, had the rarer skill to preserve himself from her fascinations. He is even said to have contemplated her murder, as the best service he could do at once to Antony and himself, and to have afterward taken credit with Augustus for such a proof of friendship to his patron.

In the spring of 31, the year of the battle of Actium, Judæa was visited by an earthquake, the effects of which appear to have been indeed tremendous: 10,000,⁷ or, according to another account,⁸ 20,000 persons were killed by the fall of buildings, and an immense quantity of cattle. The panic at Jerusalem was very severe; but it was calmed by the arguments of Herod, then departing to a campaign on the east of Jordan for the interests of Cleopatra, against Malchus, king of Arabia. This campaign, in which Herod won a dear-bought victory, kept him, whether by good fortune or design, from following Antony to Actium. He went to meet the conqueror at Rhodes, having first put an end to all rivalry from the Asmonæan house by the execution of the aged Hyrcanus on a charge of treason (B.C. 30). He intrusted the government to his brother Pheroras, and provided for the safety of his family in the fortress of Massada. Mariamne and her mother were placed in Alexandrion, under the care of his steward Joseph and an Ituræan named Soëmus, with the same secret instructions as before. Herod had not miscalculated his personal influence over the young Octavian. Instead of apologizing for his faithful adherence to Antony, he urged it as a proof of the constancy which the conqueror might expect. He returned to Judæa, invested anew with the diadem, and honored with marks of personal favor. He shortly after met Octavian on his way to Egypt at Ptolemais, and secured his favor by a magnificent entertainment, by providing for all the wants of the Roman army, and by a present of 800 talents.

⁷ *Ant.* xv. 5, § 2.

⁸ *B. J.* i. 12. § 3.

§ 2. When the tragedy of Antony and Cleopatra was consummated, and Egypt reduced to a Roman province, Octavian restored to Herod those parts of Palestine which Antony had presented to Cleopatra, as well as the fortresses and maritime towns, which had long been the objects of dispute, as Gadara, Samaria, Joppa, Gaza, and the Tower of Straton, soon to become the princely city of Cæsarea. Herod was now master of a kingdom which included all the land originally divided among the twelve tribes, together with Idumæa. Exclusive of the latter country, the whole was divided into four districts, a clear conception of which is needful for understanding the topography of our Lord's ministry:—i. JUDÆA; extending from the confines of Egypt and the southern desert to a line drawn from Joppa, not far different from the 32d parallel of latitude. ii. SAMARIA; whose N. boundary ran along the hills S. of the plain of Esdraëlon, meeting the sea S. of Dora. iii. GALILEE, Lower and Upper; extending northward as far as the parallel of Mount Hermon; but shut out from the sea by the narrow strip of Phœnice, which reached S. of Carmel and even of Dora. iv. PERÆA,⁹ the name of the whole region E. of Jordan and the Dead Sea as far S. as the Arnon, which was again subdivided into—(1) *Peræa*, in the narrower sense, between the Arnon and the Jabbok: (2) *Galaaditis*, the old land of Gilead, partly overlapping the former: (3) *Batanæa*, (4) *Gaulonitis*, and (5) *Ituræa* or *Auranitis*, embracing together the ancient country of *Bashan*: (6) *Trachonitis*, in the wild rocky desert of the *Hauran*. (7) *Abilene*, among the eastern foot-hills of the Antilibanus, lay beyond the proper limits of the country. Lastly, (8) *Decapolis*, a name at first given to Ten Cities in the north, which were rebuilt and endowed with certain privileges at the time of the first Roman occupation (B.C. 65), became the designation of a large district on both sides the lake of Galilee.

§ 3. This fair kingdom had been won (we have seen in what way) by a man of ability, magnificence, and taste; but utterly regardless of his people's most cherished feelings, and insensible to the high destiny of the "Holy Nation," the "peculiar possession of Jehovah." This idea has been for some time so steadily fading, that the sacred name has almost disappeared from our pages; but it was reserved for the Idumæan usurper at once to reunite the nation, and to heathen-

⁹ ἡ περαια (sc. χώρα), the opposite country, is a general term in Greek geography for any land on the opposite side of a river, strait, etc., as we say "over the water."

ize its government, and so to prove the need, while smoothing the way, for the advent of the Christ. Meanwhile Herod's prosperity was poisoned by unparalleled domestic tragedies. Alexandra and Mariamne had again won from Soëmus the secret of Herod's fatal orders, and this time the wife's indignation and the renewed accusations of Salome were too strong for Herod's fondness. Convinced at length that guilty love was the price of his betrayed secret, Herod doomed Mariamne to death; and her last moments were insulted by the reproaches with which her mother purchased a brief respite for herself. The proud and beautiful queen died with the courage of innocence, leaving Herod the victim of a remorse which never ceased. In its first transports he retired into solitude, and fell dangerously ill. Alexandra now thought the time was come to consummate her intrigues and revenge; but her plot for seizing the Tower of Baris was betrayed to Herod, and she was led to the fate which her daughter had so lately suffered. Her death removed Herod's last fears from the Asmonæans; but his illness seems to have given the last permanent tinge of morose cruelty to his stern temper. Among many distinguished victims to the charge of an Asmonæan conspiracy was Costabaras, an Idumæan, the former husband of Salome, who had divorced him in direct violation of the law.

§ 4. Herod's public administration was directed to the increase of his own royal state, and the gratification of his imperial master. But he probably acted also from the more subtle policy of "counterbalancing by a strong Grecian party the turbulent and exclusive spirit of the Jews." The Jews, who had so nobly resisted the attempt to persecute them into Hellenism, were now invited to adopt both Greek and Roman customs. The holy hill, to which David had carried up the ark of God, looked down upon a theatre and amphitheatre, in which Herod held games in honor of Augustus, with musical and dramatic contests, horse and chariot races, and the bloody fights of gladiators and wild beasts, while Jewish athletes took part in gymnastic contests. The sullen submission of the people was only overtaxed by the sight of the trophies hung round the theatre; but when Herod had them opened to show that they contained no idols, indignation gave way to ridicule. A few, however, viewed these proceedings with far sterner feelings. Ten zealots bound themselves by a vow to kill Herod in the theatre; but they were discovered and put to death, enduring the most cruel torments with the constancy of the Maccabæan martyrs.

At this time Herod occupied the old palace of the Asmonæans, which crowned the eastern face of the upper city, and stood adjoining the Xystus at the end of the bridge which formed the communication between the south part of the Temple and the upper city.¹⁰ This palace was not yet so magnificent as he afterward made it, but it was already most richly furnished.¹¹ Herod had now also completed the improvements of the Baris—the fortress built by John Hyrcanus on the foundations of Simon Maccabæus—which he had enlarged and strengthened at great expense, and named *Antonia*—after his friend Mark Antony.¹² This celebrated fortress formed an intimate part of the TEMPLE, as reconstructed by Herod. It stood at the west end of the north wall of the Temple, and was inaccessible on all sides but that.¹³ He provided a refuge, in case of need, from the hostility of Jerusalem, in the two fortresses of Gaba in Galilee and Heshbon in Peræa. A similar feeling was displayed in his restoration of Samaria, which he called Sebaste,¹⁴ in honor of Augustus, and peopled with his veteran soldiers mingled with descendants of the old Samaritans. But his greatest undertaking in this sort was the erection of a new maritime city on the site of the Tower of Straton. An exposed anchorage was converted into a safe harbor by a mole 200 feet wide, constructed of immense stones and fortified with towers. The city, magnificently built in the Græco-Roman style of architecture, rose in the form of an amphitheatre from the quays that lined the harbor. Among its public buildings were a theatre and amphitheatre; and in its centre stood a temple dedicated to Augustus, with two colossal statues, one of Rome, and the other of the Emperor, in whose honor the city was called CÆSAREA. That all might be in keeping, it was peopled chiefly by Greeks. Its erection occupied twelve years. Designed probably for Herod's new capital, whenever he might feel it safe to throw off the last shred of Judaism, it became before long the seat of Roman government. Meanwhile its maritime position brought Judæa into closer contact than ever with the Roman world. Its ruins, which still bear the

¹⁰ Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 8, § 5; comp. xx. 8, § 11, and *B. J.* ii. 16, § 3. had been at least seven or eight years in progress.

¹¹ Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 9, § 2.

¹³ See *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

¹² The name was probably not bestowed later than B.C. 34 or 33—the date of Herod's closest relations with Antony; and we may therefore infer that the alterations to, the fortress

¹⁴ Σεβαστός was the Greek translation of the Latin *Augustus*, and was used throughout the East as the title of the Emperor.

imperial name, *Kaisarieh*, have no other inhabitants than wild beasts, serpents, lizards, and scorpions. Herod's leaning to the religion of Rome was further shown by his erecting a temple of white marble, dedicated to Augustus, at the chief source of the Jordan, which had already acquired the heathen name of *Panium* (the *Cave of Pan*). Around this temple his son Philip afterward built the city of *Cæsarea-Philippi*, in honor of Tiberius.

Herod's sons by Mariamne, Aristobulus and Alexander, were sent to be educated at Rome; and he lost no opportunity of waiting upon Augustus, whether in his wars or his peaceful progresses. At the same time he maintained the closest friendship with the great minister Agrippa, so that "Cæsar was said to assign Herod the next place in his favor to Agrippa; Agrippa to esteem Herod higher than any of his friends, except Augustus." This intimacy was the cause of the introduction into the family of Herod's son, Aristobulus, of the name of AGRIPPA, which appears in the *Acts of the Apostles*.¹⁸ He courted the people of Greece by magnificent donations to the temple at Olympia, and was made perpetual president of the Olympic games—a strange mutation for both Jews and Greeks, that a half-heathen king of Judæa should be the recognized head of the Hellenic race.

Herod's subjects were not without some compensation for all these insults to their national traditions. True, he put down every show of opposition with relentless severity. His perpetual fears of the Pharisees and Essenes prompted him to require of them an oath of allegiance, and he knew how to revenge himself for their obstinate refusal. His espionage was always vigilant, and many murmurers disappeared forever in the prison of Hyrcania, which has been called Herod's Bastile. But he displayed a princely liberality. His great works enriched the industrious, without adding to the burdens of the country; and the taxes were diminished by a third.

The year 25—the next after the attempt on Herod's life in the theatre—was one of great misfortunes. A long drought, followed by unproductive seasons, involved Judæa in famine, and its usual consequence, a dreadful pestilence. Herod took a noble and at the same time a most politic course. He sent to Egypt for corn, sacrificing for the purchase the costly decorations of his palace and his silver and gold plate. He was thus able to make regular distributions of corn and

¹⁸ See the Genealogical Table.

ing, on an enormous scale, for the present necessities of the people, as well as to supply seed for the next year's crop.¹⁶ The result was to remove to a great degree the animosity occasioned by his proceedings in the previous year.

In this year or the next Herod took another wife, the daughter of an obscure priest of Jerusalem named Simon. Shortly before the marriage Simon was made high-priest in the room of Joshua, or Jesus, the son of Phaneus, who appears to have succeeded Ananel, and was now deposed to make way for Herod's future father-in-law.¹⁷ It was probably on the occasion of this marriage that he built a new and extensive palace¹⁸ immediately adjoining the old wall at the north-west corner of the upper city,¹⁹ about the spot now occupied by the Latin convent, in which, as memorials of his connection with Cæsar and Agrippa, a large apartment, superior in size to the Sanctuary of the Temple, was named after each. This palace was very strongly fortified: it communicated with the three great towers on the wall erected shortly after, and it became the *citadel*, "special fortress," as Josephus calls it, of the upper city. A road led to it from the northern gate in the west wall of the Temple enclosure.

§ 5. But his great claim to the favor of the Jews was that restoration of the *Temple*, the design of which he announced to the people assembled at the Passover (B.C. 20 or 19). If we may believe Josephus, he pulled down the whole edifice to its foundations and laid them anew on an enlarged scale; but the ruins still exhibit, in some parts, what seem to be the foundations laid by Zerubbabel, and beneath them the more massive substructions of Solomon. The new edifice was a stately pile of Græco-Roman architecture, built in white marble with gilded *acroteria*. It is minutely described by Josephus, and the New Testament has made us familiar with the pride of the Jews in its magnificence.²⁰ A different feeling, however, marked the commencement of the work, which met with some opposition from the fear that what Herod had begun he would not be able to finish. He overcame all jealousy by engaging not to pull down any part of the existing buildings till all the materials for the new edifice were collected on its site. Two years appear to have been occupied in these preparations, among which Josephus mentions the teach-

¹⁶ Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 9, § 2.

¹⁷ Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 9, § 3.

¹⁸ The old palace of the Asmonæans continued to be known as "the

royal palace" (Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 8, § 11).

¹⁹ Joseph. *B. J.* v. 4, § 4.

²⁰ See *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

ing some of the priests and Levites to work as masons and carpenters—and then the work began.

The holy "house" (ναός), including the Porch, Sanctuary, and Holy of Holies, was finished in a year and a half (B.C. 16). Its completion, on the anniversary of Herod's inauguration, was celebrated by lavish sacrifices and a great feast. Yet even this splendid work was not likely to mislead the Jews as to the real spirit of the king. While he rebuilt the temple at Jerusalem, he rebuilt also the temple at Samaria, and made provision, in his new city of Cæsarea, for the celebration of heathen worship; and it has been supposed that the rebuilding of the Temple furnished him with the opportunity of destroying the authentic collection of genealogies which was of the highest importance to the priestly families. Herod, as appears from his public designs, affected the dignity of a second Solomon, but he joined the license of that monarch to his magnificence; and it was said that the monument which he raised over the royal tombs was due to the fear which seized him after a sacrilegious attempt to rob them of secret treasures.

About B.C. 9—eight years from the commencement—the court and cloisters of the Temple were finished, and the bridge between the south cloister and the upper city (demolished by Pompey) was doubtless now rebuilt with that massive masonry of which some remains still survive.²¹ At this time equally magnificent works were being carried on in another part of the city, namely, in the old wall at the north-west corner, contiguous to the palace, where three towers of great size and magnificence were erected on the wall, and one as an outwork at a small distance to the north. The latter was called Psephinus, the three former were Hippicus, after one of his friends—Phasaëlus, after his brother—and Mariamne, after his queen.²² Phasaëlus appears to have been erected first of the three,²³ though it can not have been begun at the time of Phasaël's death, as that took place some years before Jerusalem came into Herod's hands. The Temple continued afterward to receive fresh additions, besides the repairs of injuries done in frequent tumults, so that, when it was visited by our Lord at the beginning of his ministry (A.D. 27), it was said that the building had occupied the intervening forty years. Nor did it cease then; for Josephus places its completion by Herod Agrippa II. about A.D. 65, only five years before its final destruction; an act in which its finisher, and the great-

²¹ For their positions see the plan.

²² Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 10, § 2.

grandson of its founder, was the ally of the Romans, A.D. 70. The great Agrippa, though a heathen, is connected with the Temple in another way. When on a visit to Herod, he propitiated the Jews by offering a hecatomb of oxen, and feasted all the people, Herod having joined in his heathen sacrifices at Cæsarea. During this period, in fact, Herod was drawing closer to his patron. In the beginning of B.C. 14 he joined Agrippa in the Euxine with a powerful fleet, and his services were rewarded by the addition of the territory to the east of the lake of Gennesareth, where Herod hunted the robbers of Trachonitis out of their mountain caves with wonderful vigor and relentless cruelty. Part of this region was formed into a tetrarchy for his brother Pheroras. He also procured from Agrippa the restoration of privileges and immunities to the Jews of the "Dispersion." On his return, in the autumn of the same year, he addressed the people assembled at the Feast of Tabernacles, and remitted them a fourth of the annual tax.

§ 6. The eye turned from all this splendor to Herod's domestic life meets one of the most appalling spectacles in the pages of history. The source of all his cruelties is to be found in his usurpation. His jealousy was excited by the Asmonæan blood which flowed in the veins of his own sons by his marriage with Mariamne; and his conscience, ever reproaching him with her murder, prompted him to suspect her avengers in her children. Those who had urged him on to the condemnation of Mariamne had better reason for the like fears on their own account. So when Herod brought back Aristobulus and Alexander from their three years' residence at Rome,²² their destruction was already half-prepared. Their fate was sealed by the enthusiasm of the people, who hailed in their graceful persons and popular manners the true scions of the Asmonæan house. Herod, who never displayed that morose depravity which loves wickedness for its own sake, treated the youths at first like a father. He married Alexander to Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and Aristobulus to his cousin Berenice, the daughter of Salome. Even this union did not appease Salome's jealous ambition. With the aid of Herod's brother, Pheroras, she so far wrought on his fears as to induce him to send for ANTIPATER, his eldest son by Doris, whom he had divorced to

²² This journey to Rome took place | Herod appears to have returned to immediately after the feast of the first | Jerusalem with the young princes in inauguration of the Temple, and the following spring (B.C. 15).

marry Mariamne. Antipater proved a deadly and unscrupulous enemy to his brothers, who were at length carried by Herod before the tribunal of Augustus at Aquileia (B.C. 13). Herod was accompanied by NICOLAUS DAMASCENUS, the intimate friend both of Augustus and himself, whose eloquence was so often of service to the Herodian family. This distinguished rhetorician, a native of Damascus, and the son of Antipater and Stratonice, was the companion of Herod's studies, and his mediator with Augustus whenever some especially flagrant act of the Jewish king stirred the emperor's indignation. His name is curiously preserved in the mediæval appellation of the palm-tree (*nicolai*), a present of the finest fruit of which was made to him by Augustus on this occasion. Nicolaus wrote lives of Augustus and of himself, and a Universal History. The emperor effected a reconciliation; but still Antipater was placed before the sons of Mariamne in the succession to the throne; and, being sent to Rome in the train of Agrippa, he tried in all his letters to renew Herod's suspicions against them. Herod's return from a visit to Rome, in B.C. 11, was again followed by an address to the people assembled at the Feast of Tabernacles, in which the announcement of Antipater as his successor—a prince not of the Asmonæan blood—was recommended by new exemptions. The whole atmosphere of the court was poisoned with distrust. False accusers shared the fate of the accused; slaves were tortured to extract evidence; and at last Alexander was tempted to a most improbable confession. A fresh trial took place at Berytus before the Roman governors of Syria, Saturninus and Volumnius, with a court of 150 assessors, by a majority of whom the youths were condemned unheard, and Herod's claim to the power of life and death over them was confirmed. After some hesitation he caused them to be strangled at Sebaste.

In or about the year 7 occurred the affair of the Golden Eagle, a parallel to that of the theatre, and, like that, important, as showing how strongly the Maccabæan spirit of resistance to innovation on the Jewish law still existed, and how vain were any concessions in other directions, in the presence of such innovations. Herod had fixed a large golden eagle, the symbol of the Roman empire, of which Judæa was now a province, over the entrance to the Sanctuary, probably at the same time that he inscribed the name of Agrippa on the gate.²⁴ As a breach of the second commandment—more than as a

²⁴ Joseph. *B. J.* i. 21, § 2.

badge of dependence—this had excited the indignation of the Jews, and especially of two of the chief rabbis, who instigated their disciples to tear it down. A false report of the king's death was made the occasion of doing this in open day, and in the presence of a large number of people. Being taken before Herod, the rabbis defended their conduct and were burned alive. The high-priest Matthias was deposed, and Joazar took his place.

To complete the series of his domestic tragedies, Herod's favored son, Antipater, conspired against his life with his favorite brother, Pheroras. The wife of Pheroras was connected with the Pharisees, 7000 of whom had refused to take the oath of allegiance, and she was accused of disseminating disloyal prophecies. Pheroras fell into disgrace; but in his last illness, which soon followed, Herod treated him with a kindness which moved him to abandon his designs. Upon his death, not without suspicion of poison, Herod instituted an inquiry; the whole plot was revealed, and proved by the confession of his wife. Antipater, who had gone to Rome to avoid suspicion, was returning to reap, as he supposed, the fruit of his parricide, when he was seized at Sebaste, brought to trial before Herod and Varus, the Roman governor of Syria, and condemned on the clearest evidence.

§ 7. While his doom awaited the confirmation of Augustus, Herod was seized with a most painful and loathsome disease. The increasing torments of his ulcerated body, which derived no benefit from the warm baths of Callirhoë, drove him to new acts of frenzied cruelty; but we may well doubt whether the fancy of what he *might* have felt does not prevail over sober fact in the statement, that he ordered the representatives of the chief families of Judæa to be shut up in the hippodrome at Jericho, and to be put to death as soon as he expired, that his funeral might not want mourners.

His rage and terror were brought to a climax by a new and strange danger, threatening the crown which had cost him so much. A caravan, headed by persons of great distinction,* arrived at Jerusalem, making the ominous inquiry, "Where is he that is born KING OF THE JEWS?" and declaring that the star of his Nativity had guided them from the distant East. Herod well knew the significance of that title. His agitation was shared by all the people of Jerusalem, though doubtless from widely different feelings. Assembling the teachers of the law, he obtained their opinion, on the authority of the

* Who these persons were will be considered in the next book.

prophet Micah, that Bethlehem would be the birthplace of the Messiah. Secretly calling for the strangers, and having learned from them the precise time of the star's appearance, he sent them to Bethlehem, and bade them return to inform him when they had found the babe, that he too might go and worship Him. Having in vain awaited their return, he resolved to rid himself of the dreaded rival by the massacre of all the babes in Bethlehem and its district, from the age of two years old and under. The consummation of this sentence, and the escape of Jesus, belong to the next book of our history. We here regard the transaction from the point of view of Herod's life. Vast as we know the issues at stake to have been, we can hardly be surprised that, amid all the horrors of Herod's last days, the murder of some ten or twelve children in a small country town²⁶ escaped the notice of the Jews at the time, and of their historian afterward.

They soon had horrors enough in their very midst. The embassy returned from Rome, with the consent of Augustus to Herod's dealing as he pleased with his guilty son, though the milder alternative of banishment was suggested. About the same time, Herod attempted suicide in a paroxysm of agony. The rumor of his death spread through the palace. Antipater tried to bribe his jailer, who reported the offer to Herod, and the tyrant's dying breath gave the order for his son's execution. It appears to have been in connection with the fate of Antipater, perhaps as the expression of his own disgust in yielding to the king's importunity, that Augustus uttered the celebrated sarcasm, "It is better to be Herod's hog than his son:"—for his religion forbade his slaughtering the former. But, if we look more closely into the form in which the story is preserved, we shall find that, amid an accidental confusion, it supplies an incidental proof that the massacre of Bethlehem was known at Rome.²⁷ After using his last remnant of strength to give final directions about his will, he expired five days after the death of Antipater, shortly before the Passover, B.C. 4. He had just entered on the

²⁶ Such is the result of a sober calculation, founded on our knowledge of Bethlehem. The accurate simplicity of St. Matthew (ii. 16-18) may be contrasted with the vague statements of the fathers that Herod slew "all the children in Bethlehem" (Justin and Origen), and with the exaggerated impressions made on us by the painters.

²⁷ According to the anecdote preserved by Macrobius (cir. A.D. 410)—"Augustus, quum andisset, *inter muros quos in Syria Herodes, Rex Judæorum, intra biunatū jussit interfici, filium quoque ejus occisum, ait, 'Melius est Herodis porcum esse, quam filium.'*"

thirty-seventh year of his reign, dating from the edict which gave him the kingdom, and the thirty-fourth of his actual possession of the throne, dating from the death of Antigonus."²⁰

§ 8. Enough has appeared of Herod's abilities and vices in this summary of his reign. It is, perhaps, difficult to see in his character any of the true elements of greatness. Some have even supposed that the title—the *great*—is a mistranslation for the *elder*; and yet on the other hand he seems to have possessed the good qualities of our own Henry VIII., with his vices. He maintained peace at home, during a long reign, by the vigor and timely generosity of his administration. Abroad he conciliated the good-will of the Romans under circumstances of unusual difficulty. His ostentatious display, and even his arbitrary tyranny, was calculated to inspire Orientals with awe. Bold and yet prudent, oppressive and yet profuse, he had many of the characteristics which make a popular hero; and the title which may have been first given in admiration of successful despotism now serves to bring out in clearer contrast the terrible price at which the success was purchased.


It remains to say a word upon his relation to the whole course of Divine Providence in the history of the Jews. As a usurper of an alien race, and that the hated race of Edom, and the destroyer of the Asmonæan house and kingdom, he cleared the ground of all who might have lawfully competed with Christ for the throne of David; while his power united the Holy Land, in preparation for the advent of its predicted King. Nor was even his personal character without its bearing on the coming of the Christ. No government, except perhaps one that maintains its power over an enslaved but noble people by brute force, is much worse in its moral character than the people who submit to it; and Herod is in some sense the representative of the deep moral degradation of the Jews. The religious puritanism, which the bitter lesson of the Captivity had impressed on the Jewish Church, was still maintained, though only in outward form, by the Pharisees; and a remnant of its living spirit was preserved amid the fanaticism of the Essenes; but the more than half-heathen pomp of Herod too truly represented the worldly spirit which looked for an earthly kingdom as its highest hope. Nor are the family feuds, which stained the house of Herod with perpet-


²⁰ There is now no doubt that the common era of the birth of our Saviour is wrong by four years. Christ was born shortly before the death of Herod, and we know that the latter died four years before the Christian era.

ual blood, without their deep significance. The palace gave the worst example, but still only an example, of that dissolution of the bonds of nature, which the prophet Malachi had marked as a sign of His coming, who alone could restore peace. The time was evidently at hand, when “Elijah the prophet should be sent before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: to *turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers*, lest He should come and smite the earth with a curse.”²⁸

And, before Herod's reign had closed, both that Prophet and the Christ himself had been born. Their entrance into the world forms the subject now before us; but we shall be the better prepared to enter on the history of Christ and the Apostles, by first taking a summary view of the princes of Herod's house, who ruled in different parts of Palestine, with different degrees of power, and of the Roman dominion in the country, till the destruction of Jerusalem. In fact, the history divides itself, at Herod's death, into two portions which intersect almost without mingling; that of Christ and his Church, and that of the Jews as a nation. The latter belongs rather to the history of the Old Covenant than of the New. It is the story of the last expiring effort of a noble but corrupted and mistaken people, to defend their supposed rights against the earthly masters to whose yoke they had already bowed, and against the spiritual Lord whom they resisted because they knew him not. Perhaps the devout student of the spiritual conflict is too often at a disadvantage for want of a comprehensive view of the external relations of the Jewish nation. This distinction is thus insisted on by the eloquent historian of the Jews:—“The history of the Jews, after the death of Herod (not rightly named the Great) and the birth of Jesus, separates itself into two streams: one narrow at first, and hardly to be traced in its secret windings into the world, but with the light of heaven upon it, and gradually widening till it embraces a large part of Asia, part of Africa, the whole of Europe, and becomes a mighty irresistible river—a river with many branches—gladdening and fertilizing mankind, and bearing civilization, as well as holiness and happiness, in its course;—the other at first as expansive, but gradually shrinking into obscurity, lost in deep, almost impenetrable, ravines; sullen apparently and lonely, yet not without its peculiar majesty in its continuous, inexhaustible, irrepressible flow, and not without its own peculiar influence as an under-

²⁸ Mal. iv. 5, 6.





current on the general life and progress of mankind; . . . too often attempted to be cruelly dried up by violent means, or turned into blood, yet still emerging when seeming almost lost, and flowing on, as it still flows, and seems destined to flow. Though the Jewish and Christian history have much in common, they may be kept almost entirely distinct." This remark applies especially to what remains to be told of the house of Herod.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) THE HERODIANS.

IN the account which is given by St. Matthew (xxii. 15 ff.) and St. Mark (xii. 13 ff.) of the last efforts made by different sections of the Jews to obtain from our Lord himself the materials for his accusation, a party under the name of *Herodians* is represented as acting in concert with the Pharisees (Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 13). St. Mark mentions the combination of the two parties for a similar object at an earlier period (Mark iii. 6), and in another place (viii. 15; cf. Luke xii. 1) he preserves a saying of our Lord, in which "the leaven of Herod" is placed in close connection with "the leaven of the Pharisees." In the Gospel of St. Luke, on the other hand, the Herodians are not brought forward at all by name.

These very scanty notices of the Evangelists as to the position of the Herodians are not compensated by other testimonies; yet it is not difficult to fix their characteristics by a reference to the condition of Jewish feeling in the Apostolic age. There were probably many who saw in the power of the Herodian family the pledge of the preservation of their

national existence in the face of Roman ambition. In proportion as they regarded the independent nationality of the Jewish people as the first condition of the fulfillment of its future destiny, they would be willing to acquiesce in the dominion of men who were themselves of foreign descent, and not rigid in the observance of the Mosaic ritual. Two distinct classes might thus unite in supporting what was a domestic tyranny as contrasted with absolute dependence on Rome, those who saw in the Herods a protection against direct heathen rule, which was the one object of their fear, and those who were inclined to look with satisfaction upon such a compromise between the ancient faith and heathen civilization, as Herod the Great and his successors had endeavored to realize, as the true and highest consummation of Jewish hopes. On the one side the Herodians—partisans of Herod in the widest sense of the term—were thus brought into union with the Pharisees, on the other, with the Sadducees. Yet there is no reason to suppose that they endeavored to form any very systematic harmony of the conflicting doctrines of the two sects, but

rather the conflicting doctrines themselves were thrown into the background by what appeared to be a paramount political necessity. Such coalitions have been frequent in every age; and the rarity of the allusions to the Herodians, as a marked body, seems to show that this, like similar coalitions, had no enduring influence as the foundation of a party. The feelings which led to the coalition remained, but they were incapable of animating the common action of a united body for any length of time.

(B.) TEMPLE OF HEROD.

(See Plan, p. 76.)

For our knowledge of the last and greatest of the Jewish Temples we are indebted almost wholly to the works of Josephus, with an occasional hint from the Talmud.

The Temple or *Naos* itself was in dimensions and arrangement very similar to that of Solomon, or rather that of Zerubbabel—more like the latter; but this was surrounded by an inner enclosure of great strength and magnificence, measuring as nearly as can be made out 180 cubits by 240, and adorned by porches and ten gate-ways of great magnificence; and beyond this again was an outer enclosure measuring externally 400 cubits each way, which was adorned with porticoes of greater splendor than any we know of as attached to any temple of the ancient world: all showing how strongly Roman influence was at work in enveloping with heathen magnificence the simple templar arrangements of a Semitic people, which, however, remained nearly unchanged amid all this external incrustation.

The Temple was certainly situated in the S.W. angle of the area now known as the Haram area at

Jerusalem, and its dimensions were what Josephus states them to be—400 cubits, or one stadium, each way.*

At the time when Herod rebuilt it, he enclosed a space “twice as large” as that before occupied by the Temple and its courts, an expression that probably must not be taken too literally, at least if we are to depend on the measurements of Hecataeus. According to them, the whole area of Herod’s Temple was between four and five times greater than that which preceded it. What Herod did apparently was to take in the whole space between the Temple and the city wall on its eastern side, and to add a considerable space on the north and south, to support the porticoes which he added there.

As the Temple terrace thus became the principal defense of the city on the east side, there were no gates or openings in that direction, and being situated on a sort of rocky brow—as evidenced from its appearance in the vaults that bound it on this side—it was at all later times considered unattackable from the eastward. The north side, too, where not covered by the fortress Antonia, became part of the defenses of the city, and was likewise without external gates. On the south side, which was enclosed by the wall of Ophel, there were double gates nearly in the centre. These gates still exist at a distance of about 365 feet from the south-western angle, and are perhaps the only architectural features of the Temple of Herod which remain *in situ*. This entrance consists of a double archway of Cyclopean architecture on the level of the ground, opening into a square vestibule measuring 40 feet each way. From this a double tunnel, nearly

* Comp. *O. T. Hist.* ch. xxii. § 5, etc., and ch. xxvii. *Notes and Ill. (A)*, concerning the Temples of Solomon and Zerubbabel.

200 feet in length, leads to a flight of steps which rise to the surface in the court of the Temple, exactly at that gate-way of the inner Temple which led to the altar, and is the one of the four gate-ways on this side by which any one arriving from Ophel would naturally wish to enter the inner enclosure. We learn from the Talmud that the gate of the inner Temple to which this passage led was called the "Water Gate;" and it is interesting to be able to identify a spot so prominent in the description of Nehemiah (xii. 37). Toward the west there were four gate-ways to the external enclosure of the Temple, and the positions of three of these can still be traced with certainty. The first or most southern led over the bridge, the remains of which were identified by Dr. Robinson (of which a view is given at the head of the next chapter), and joined the Stoa Basilica of the Temple with the royal palace. The second was that discovered by Dr. Barclay, 270 feet from the S.W. angle, at a level of 17 feet below that of the southern gates just described. The site of the third is so completely covered by the buildings of the Meckmé that it has not yet been seen, but it will be found between 200 and 250 feet from the N.W. angle of the Temple area; for, owing to the greater width of the southern portico beyond that on the northern, the Temple itself was not in the centre of its enclosure, but situated more toward the north. The fourth was that which led over the causeway which still exists at a distance of 600 feet from the south-western angle.

Cloisters.—The most magnificent part of the Temple, in an architectural point of view, seems certainly to have been the cloisters which were added to the outer court when it was enlarged by Herod. The

cloisters in the west, north, and east sides were composed of double rows of Corinthian columns, 25 cubits or 37 feet 6 inches in height, with flat roofs, and resting against the outer wall of the Temple. These, however, were immeasurably surpassed in magnificence by the royal porch or Stoa Basilica, which overhung the southern wall. It consisted of a nave and two aisles, that toward the Temple being open, that toward the country closed by a wall. The breadth of the centre aisle was 45 feet; of the side aisles 30 from centre to centre of the pillars; their height 50 feet, and that of the centre aisle 100 feet. Its section was thus something in excess of that of York Cathedral, while its total length was one stadium or 600 Greek feet, or 100 feet in excess of York, or our largest Gothic cathedrals. This magnificent structure was supported by 162 Corinthian columns.

The court of the Temple was very nearly a square. It may have been exactly so, for we have not all the details to enable us to feel quite certain about it. The *Middoth* says it was 187 cubits E. and W., and 187 N. and S. To the eastward of this was the court of the women. The great ornament of these inner courts seems to have been their gate-ways, the three especially on the north and south leading to the Temple court. These, according to Josephus, were of great height, strongly fortified and ornamented with great elaboration. But the wonder of all was the great eastern gate leading from the court of the women to the upper court. It was in all probability the one called the "Beautiful Gate" in the New Testament.

Immediately within this gate-way stood the altar of burnt-offerings. Both the Altar and the Temple were enclosed by a low parapet one cubit in height, placed so as to keep the

people separate from the priests while the latter were performing their functions.

Within this last enclosure, toward the westward, stood the TEMPLE itself. As before mentioned, its internal dimensions were the same as

those of the Temple of Solomon. There is no reason for doubting that the Sanctuary always stood on the identically same spot in which it had been placed by Solomon a thousand years before it was rebuilt by Herod.



Capital of Pillar in Vestibule of the Southern Entrance of Herod's Temple.



Remains of Arch of Bridge of the Temple. (See p. 94.)

CHAPTER V.

SECULAR HISTORY OF THE JEWS, FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM. B.C. 4—A.D. 70.

- § 1. Family and testament of Herod—Archelaus and Antipas—Collisions with the Romans at Jerusalem—Augustus confirms Herod's will. § 2. **ARCHELAUS** ethnarch of Judæa—His tyranny and banishment. § 3. **HEROD ANTIPAS** tetrarch of Galilee—His relations to Herodias and John the Baptist—War with Aretas—Joins with Pilate in condemning Christ—His deposition and banishment. § 4. **HEROD PHILIP** tetrarch of Northern Peræa—The city of Cæsarea Philippi. § 5. Judæa under Roman Procurators—i. **SABINUS**—ii. **CORONIS**, under Quirinus (Cyprianus) prefect of Syria—Census—Pollution of the Temple—iii. **AMBIVIVUS**—iv. **ANNIUS RUFTUS**—v. **VALERIUS GRATUS**—vi. **PONTIUS PILATUS**—Caiaphas high-priest—Pilate's provocations and outrages against the Jews—Pilate and Christ—His recall and banishment—**VITELLIVS** prefect of Syria—His benefits to the Jews—Death of **TIBERIUS** and accession of **CALIGULA**—**MARCELLUS** procurator of Judæa—The Jews persecute the Christians. § 6. **PETRONIVS**, prefect of Syria, ordered to erect a statue of Caligula in the Temple—The emperor's claims to divine worship in all the provinces, resisted by the Jews—Tumults at Alexandria—The Greeks encouraged by the prefect **Flaccus**—Sufferings and massacre of the Jews—Recall of **Flaccus**—Deputation to Caligula, headed by **Philo**—**Philo's** account of their extraordinary reception—Resistance in Judæa—The decree suspended—Death of Caligula. § 7. **HEROD AGRIPPA I.** made king of Judæa by **CLAUDIUS**—Imperial edict of toleration for the Jews—Agrippa's Jewish policy—Fortification of Jerusalem—Martyrdom of St. James—Power and magnificence of Agrippa. § 8. Judæa again under Roman Procurators—

HEROD AGRIPPA II. tetrarch of Eastern Palestine—His character and influence with the Jews—Agrippa and Paul—His splendid buildings—His sisters Berenice and Drusilla—Takes part with the Romans in the Jewish War—Retirement to Rome and death. § 9. Roman Procurators—CUSPIUS FADUS—Famine in Judæa—Paul and Barnabas at Jerusalem—VENTIDIUS CUMANUS—Tumult at the Passover—FELIX—The *Sicarii* or Assassins—Murder of the high-priest—General disorder—Felix and Paul—Tyranny of Felix—Massacre at Cæsarea, a chief cause of the Jewish War—PORCIUS FESTUS—His able and upright government—Judgment of St. Paul—Affair of Agrippa's Wall—ALBINUS and ANANUS—Persecution of the Christians, and death of St. James the Less—Anarchy at Jerusalem. § 10. GESSIUS FLORUS, the last and worst of the procurators—Insurrection at Jerusalem—Interposition of Costius Gallus—Mediation of Agrippa—Renunciation of allegiance and beginning of the *Jewish War*—Factions in Jerusalem—The assassins and the zealots. § 11. Siege of Jerusalem by TITUS—Burning of the Temple, and destruction of the city. § 12. Supplemental narrative—Insurrections under Trajan and Hadrian—Foundation of *Ælia Capitolina* on the site of Jerusalem—JULIAN's attempt to rebuild the Temple.

§ 1. In order to understand fully the history of our Saviour and his Apostles, it is necessary, for the reasons stated at the close of the preceding chapter, to give previously a brief account of the secular history of the Jews during this period.

The family of Herod is shown in the genealogical table (p. 75). Of his ten wives, we need only notice the offspring of the first five. (i.) He married *Doris* before his accession to the throne; and her only son ANTIPATER was, as we have seen, the last victim of his father's dying rage. (ii.) ARISTOBULUS, his eldest son by *Mariamne*, the granddaughter of Hyrcanus, was the parent of a large family, and from him were descended the two AGRIPPAS, the first of whom was the "KING HEROD" who slew James and imprisoned Peter; the second, the "KING AGRIPPA" before whom Paul pleaded.* (iii.) After the judicial murder of *Mariamne*, Herod married another *Mariamne*, daughter of the high-priest, Simon: her son was HEROD PHILIP, whose marriage with his niece Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, followed by her divorce of him to marry his half-brother, Herod Antipas, led to the martyrdom of John the Baptist. He is often confounded with his half-brother PHILIP, the tetrarch of Ituræa. (iv.) His next wife, *Malthace*, a Samaritan, was the mother of HEROD ANTIPAS and ARCHELAUS, of whom we have presently to speak. (v.) By *Cleopatra* he had two sons, the younger of whom was PHILIP, the tetrarch of Ituræa and the adjacent districts, with Trachonitis. (vi.-x.) His other wives and

* Acts xii.

* Acts xxv.

their children are of no consequence in the history. These complicated relations will be made clearer by the following conspectus of the chief personages with whom the history is concerned, for the four generations of the family :

| A. HEROD THE GREAT. | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Wives. | Sons. | |
| i. Doris..... | 1. Antipater..... | } Executed by their father in his life-time. |
| ii. Mariamne, grandd. of Hyrcanus II. | 2. Aristobulus..... | |
| iii. Mariamne, d. of Simon.... | 3. Alexander..... | |
| | 4. HEROD PHILIP I..... | Lived as a private person. |
| | m. Herodias. | |
| iv. Malthace, a Samaritan,.... | 5. HEROD ANTIPAS..... | Tetrarch of Galilee. |
| | 6. ARCHELAUS..... | Ethnarch of Judæa. |
| v. Cleopatra..... | 7. HEROD PHILIP II..... | Tetrarch of Northern Peræa, etc. |
| | m. Salome, d. of Philip I. and Herodias. | |
| B. Children of Aristobulus. | | |
| 1. HEROD AGRIPPA I..... | | King of Judæa. |
| 2. HERODIAS, m.— | | |
| (1) Herod Philip I. | | |
| (2) Herod Antipas. | | |
| C. Children of HEROD AGRIPPA I. | | |
| 1. HEROD AGRIPPA II..... | | Tetrarch of N. Peræa, etc. |
| (titular king). | | |
| 2. BERENICE..... | | Named in Acts xxv. 23. |
| 3. DRUSILLA, m. to FELIX..... | | Named in Acts xxiv. 24. |

During his last illness, Herod made a will in favor of the sons of Malthace, who had been educated at Rome, and had been at first excluded from the inheritance through the accusations of Antipater. It was this unexpected arrangement which led to the retreat of Joseph to Galilee³ on his return with Mary and Jesus from Egypt. The elder of them, Herod Antipas, was first named by Herod his successor ; but the last change in the king's will transferred that dignity to Archelaus, leaving to Antipas the government of Galilee and Peræa (in the narrower sense), with the title of tetrarch. The northern part of the trans-Jordanic country, including Ituræa, Gaulonitis, and Batanæa, with Trachonitis, were made a tetrarchy for Philip, the son of Cleopatra. Lastly, Herod's will left an ample provision to his sister Salome, whose intrigues had been so fatal to his family, and large legacies to Augustus and his wife Julia. Herod Philip, the son of the second Mariamne, was excluded from all benefit of his father's will, in revenge for the supposed treason of his mother ; as were also the descendants of the first Mariamne.

Pending the ratification of Herod's will by Augustus, Archelaus succeeded to his father's power. The Jewish

³ Matt. ii. 22.



Burial of Herod.
 princes were released from the hippodrome, and the funeral of Herod was celebrated with great splendor. The funeral is thus described by Dean Milman:—"The lifeless remains of Herod seemed to retain his characteristic magnificence. The body was borne aloft on a bier, which was adorned with costly precious stones. The linen was of the richest dye; the winding-sheet of purple. It still wore the diadem, and, above that, the golden crown of royalty: the sceptre was in its hand. The sons and relatives of Herod attended the bier. All the military force followed, distributed according to their nations. First, his body-guard—then his foreign mercenaries, Thracians, Germans, Gauls—then, the rest of the army, in war array. Last came five hundred of his court-officers, bearing sweet spices, with which the Jews embalmed the dead. In this pomp the procession passed on, by slow stages, to the Herodium, a fortified palace, about twenty miles from Jericho."

At the end of the seven days' mourning, during which it was rumored that the pious duties of the day were relieved by nights of revelry, Archelaus gave a funeral feast to the people, and then made a solemn entry into the Temple. His speech, in which he assumed a tone of great moderation, and promised relief from his father's tyranny, was received with loud applause, not unmingled with cries for the redress of grievances. "Some called for a diminution of the public burdens; others for the release of the prisoners, with whom Herod had crowded the dungeons; some more specifically for the entire abandonment of the taxes on the sale of commodities in the markets, which had been levied with the utmost rigor. Archelaus listened with great affability, promised largely, and, having performed sacrifice, retired."

The disaffection, which was doubtless inflamed by disappointment of the hopes founded on the milder character of Herod Antipas, the expected heir, broke out into open tumult while the two brothers were preparing to start for Rome, the one to seek the emperor's confirmation of Herod's will, the other to urge his claims. At the Feast of the Passover, when Jerusalem was always filled with devout Jews, whose zeal was inflamed by their numbers and by the exaltation of feeling due to the festival, a cry was raised for vengeance on behalf of those whom Herod had executed for pulling down the eagle. The multitude were only dispersed by armed force, with the slaughter of 3000 men, and the feast was broken off. Archelaus now set out for Rome. In his train were Nicolas of Damascus, whose eloquence had so well served his father,

and Salome, who was secretly prepared to urge the claims of Herod Antipas.

Meanwhile the rapacity of the Roman officials grasped at what appeared an easy prey. Even while preparing to embark at Cæsarea, Archelaus had met Sabinus, the procurator of Syria, on his way to claim the late king's treasures. His march, suspended at the entreaties of Archelaus and the command of Varus, the prefect of Syria, was resumed as soon as the former had sailed; and his exactions gave the zealots the provocation or pretext for a tumult, which was only put down by the interference of Varus. Sabinus, left still in command at Jerusalem, soon provoked a new insurrection at the Feast of Pentecost, when the city was again filled with zealots bent on avenging their repulse at the Passover. They formed a regular encampment round the Temple, and besieged Sabinus and his legion, probably in the Antonia. The Romans made a sally against the Temple, burned the cloisters of the outer court with its defenders, broke into the sanctuary, and plundered the sacred treasures; but the Jews, furious at the sacrilege, still besieged Sabinus and his legion. The anarchy of the country was inflamed by the troops of Herod, who wandered about in bands, that fought and plundered as they pleased. To these elements of confusion was added the expectation of some great deliverer,—a feeling which now reached its climax,—and at the very time when the true Saviour was concealed in Egypt, false Messiahs were assuming the diadem, and gathering troops of banditti. Meanwhile Varus advanced to the relief of Sabinus, at the head of two legions, and among the auxiliaries were some Arabian bands, who devastated the country. The insurgents laid down their arms at his approach; and Sabinus, ashamed to meet him, set off for Rome. Two thousand of the ring-leaders were crucified, and others sent to Rome for trial. It had become plain that, whatever might be the decision of Augustus, he himself was the only master of Judæa.

The cause at issue before him was pleaded by the eloquence of Nicolas and Herod Philip (the elder) on the part of Archelaus, and by Salome and her son Antipater on that of Antipas. During its progress a deputation of 500 Jews appeared at the emperor's tribunal, praying for the suppression of royalty and the restoration of their liberties; and the statement that they were supported by no less than 8000 of their countrymen at Rome indicates the number and influence of the Jews settled in the capital. At length, Augustus confirmed the will of Herod in all essential points. Archelaus was established in

the government of Judæa, with Idumæa and Samaria, forming about half the kingdom of Herod, and bringing in a revenue of 600 talents. He was to rule under the title of *Ethnarch*, with the promise of that of *King* if he proved worthy of it. Of the chief cities in his territory, he retained Jerusalem, Sebaste, Cæsarea, and Joppa; while Gaza, Gadara, and Hippo were made Roman towns under the prefect of Syria; and Salome received Jamnia, Azotus, Phasaëlis, and a palace in Ascalon. Herod Antipas was confirmed in the tetrarchy of Galilee and Peræa, with a revenue of 200 talents, and Philip in that of Auranitis and Trachonitis.

§ 2. We have seen that the first news of the succession of Archelaus led the parents of our Lord to turn aside on their way back from Egypt, and to place their precious charge under the milder government of Herod Antipas.⁴ The fear of Joseph may be taken as an expression of the popular distrust of Archelaus, which was amply justified by the continued tyranny and disorder of his nine years' reign. At first, he showed a desire to conciliate the Jews by displacing Joazar, whom Herod had made high-priest after the affair of the eagle, in favor of his brother Eleazar. But the adherents of the Law were alienated by the marriage of Archelaus to Glaphyra, his brother Alexander's widow, for whom he divorced his wife Mariamne; and at length his tyranny provoked his subjects to appeal to Augustus. Archelaus was summoned suddenly to Rome, and banished to Vienna (*Vienne*) in Gaul (A.D. 7).⁵ This sentence put a final end to the Jewish monarchy; for the restoration of a nominal kingdom for a few years under Herod Agrippa I. (A.D. 41–44) can only be viewed as an episode in the Roman domination. "The sceptre had departed from Judah."

§ 3. Before pursuing the history of Judæa as a Roman province, it will be convenient to follow the course of the two other sons of Herod, who reigned in Palestine according to his will. HEROD ANTIPAS, the brother of Archelaus, was confirmed by Augustus, as we have seen, in the tetrarchy of Galilee and Peræa, which had been assigned to him by his father's will, and hence he is mentioned in the Gospels by the style of HEROD THE TETRARCH.⁶ His whole importance is derived

⁴ Matt. i. 22. It is to be observed that the choice of Galilee as a residence is ascribed to a divine warning in a dream; but the previous fear of going into Judæa is Joseph's own.

⁵ He is generally said to have died

at Vienne; but Jerome relates that he was shown the sepulchre of Archelaus near Bethlehem. If so, he must have returned as a private man to Judæa, and there have died.

⁶ Matt. xiv. 1; Luke iii. 1, 19; Acts xiii. 1. The "king" (*βασιλεύς*)

from his two appearances in the Gospel history, as first the hearer and then the murderer of John the Baptist, and as taking part with Pilate in the condemnation of our Lord. The first of these crimes was due to the fatal influence of Herodias, which at last brought him to his ruin. He had married a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia Petræa (the same from whose governor at Damascus St. Paul was afterward in danger). While still living with her, he formed a connection of the most disgraceful character in the eye of the Jewish law. The notorious HERODIAS, daughter of Aristobulus, the son of Mariamne and Herod the Great, and consequently sister of Herod Agrippa I., was married to Herod Philip, who was her step-uncle, being the son of Herod and the second Mariamne ;⁷ and she now deserted Philip to marry Herod Antipas, who stood to her in the same relation. Besides that her husband and his wife were both alive, Antipas, as the half-brother of Philip, was already connected with Herodias by an affinity so close, that there was only one case contemplated in the law of Moses where it could be set aside, namely, when the married brother had died childless.⁸ Now Herodias had already one child, Salome, by Philip. Well therefore may she be charged by Josephus with the intention of confounding her country's institutions, and well may John the Baptist have remonstrated against the enormity of such a connection with the tetrarch, whose conscience would certainly seem to have been less hardened than hers; for he "feared" his reprover, whose preaching he had "heard gladly," and though these impressions did not avail to keep him from adding murder to adultery, he "was sorry" to commit the crime.⁹ Aretas made war to avenge his daughter; and we have the express testimony of Josephus, that the defeat of Herod, with the loss of nearly all his army, was viewed by the Jews as a judgment for John's murder.¹⁰

Free from his father's tyrannical temper, Herod Antipas aspired to be the patron and protector of the Jews, and he ventured on an open quarrel with the Roman procurator, probably concerning those "Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices."¹¹ Herod courted favor with the

of Mark vi. 14 must be regarded as a title of courtesy.

⁷ See the Genealogical Table, p. 99.

⁸ See Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 21; and for the exception, Deut. xxv. 5 foll.

⁹ Matt. xiv. 9; Mark vi. 20. Josephus states that John was executed at Machærus, a fortress on the fron-

tier of Aretas and Herod, looking down upon the Dead Sea from the south (Robinson, i. p. 570, etc.).

¹⁰ Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5.

¹¹ Luke xiii. 1, xxiii. 12. Of this event, rendered so memorable by our Lord's application of it, we have no further information. It must

strict Jews by his visit to Jerusalem at the Passover; and the Roman procurator thought it prudent to avail himself of such an opportunity for a reconciliation by sending Jesus before Herod, who, as tetrarch, had jurisdiction over a Galilean, and as the head of the Herodian house, might gratify his hatred of "the king of the Jews." Such was the conjunction of political interests and passions, by which "both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel, were gathered together," to fulfill the divine counsels as foretold by David.¹²

These two chief passages of his life reveal the character of this weak, sensual, and superstitious prince, whose cunning was stamped by the Saviour with the epithet "that fox:"¹³ who would have been pleased to have kept both John and Jesus as prophets at his court, but was led by wanton weakness to sacrifice the one, and through the terror engendered by remorse, "would have killed" the other,¹⁴ over whom he at last indulged his spite, when he saw him safe as a prisoner to Pilate. What is left untold of his character and deeds is summed up in the pregnant phrase, which St. Luke adds to the record of his adultery with Herodias, "all the wickedness which Herod had done."¹⁵

At length the favors heaped by the emperor Caligula (who succeeded Tiberius in A.D. 37) upon his friend and comrade, Herod Agrippa,¹⁶ excited the jealous ambition of Herod Antipas. At the instigation of Herodias, he sailed with her to Rome, nominally to petition for the same royal title which had been conferred upon his nephew, but really to intrigue against him. But Agrippa, the bosom friend of Caligula, met the plot by a charge of treason against his uncle; and Antipas was banished to Lugdunum in Gaul¹⁷ (A.D. 39). It deserves

have occurred at some feast at Jerusalem, in the outer court of the Temple, since the blood of the worshippers was mingled with their sacrifices; but the silence of Josephus about it seems to show that riots and massacres on such occasions were so frequent that it was needless to recount them all.

¹² Acts iv. 25-28, with express reference to Psalm ii. 1, 2.

¹³ Luke xiii. 32.

¹⁴ Luke xiii. 31; comp. Mark vi. 16: "It is John whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead."

¹⁵ Luke iii. 19. ¹⁶ See below, § 7.

¹⁷ This town is probably Lugdunum Convenarum, a town of Gaul, situated on the right bank of the Garonne, at the foot of the Pyrenees, now *St. Bertrand de Comminges* (Murray, *Handb. of France*, p. 314); Eusebius, *H. E.* i. 11, says *Vienne*, confounding Antipas with Archelaus; Burton (on Matt. xiv. 3), Alford, and moderns in general, *Lyon*. In Josephus (*B. J.* ii. 9, § 6), Antipas is said to have died in Spain, apparently, from the context, the land of his exile. A town on the frontier, therefore, like the above, would satisfy both passages.

to be recorded of Herodias, that she preferred sharing the exile of Antipas, till death ended his reverses, to remaining with her brother Agrippa, and partaking of his elevation.¹⁸

The city of TIBERIAS, which Antipas founded and named in honor of the emperor, was the most conspicuous monument of his long reign; but, like the rest of the Herodian family, he showed his passion for building cities in several places, restoring Sepphoris, near Tabor, which had been destroyed in the wars after the death of Herod the Great,¹⁹ and Betharamptha (Beth-haram) in Peræa, which he named Julias, "from the wife of the emperor."²⁰

§ 4. HEROD PHILIP II.²¹ was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra. Like his half-brothers Antipas and Archelaus, he was brought up at home, and on the death of his father advocated the claims of Archelaus before Augustus. He received as his own government "Batanæa, Trachonitis, Auranitis (Gaulonitis), and some parts about Jamnia,"²² with the title of tetrarch. His rule was distinguished by justice and moderation,²³ and he appears to have devoted himself entirely to the duties of his office without sharing in the intrigues which disgraced his family.²⁴ He built a new city on the site of Paneas, near the sources of the Jordan, which he called Cæsarea,²⁵ and raised Bethsaida (in lower Gaulonitis) to the rank of a city under the title of Julias, and died there A.D. 34.²⁶ He married Salome, the daughter of Philip I. and Herodias, but, as he left no children, his dominions were added at his death to the Roman province of Syria.

The city of Cæsarea Philippi, chosen by Philip the tetrarch as the site of his villas and palaces, beside his father's temple

¹⁸ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 7, § 2.

¹⁹ Jos. *Ant.* xvii. 12, § 9, xviii. 2, § 1.

²⁰ Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 2, § 1; Hieron. *Euseb. Chron.* A.D. 29, *Livias*.

²¹ The numeral is used to distinguish him from his half-brother Herod Philip I. (Φίλιππος, Mark vi. 17), the son of Herod the Great and Mariamne the daughter of a high-priest Simon (Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 6, § 4), the husband of Herodias, and father of Salome. He is called only Herod by Josephus, but the repetition of the name Philip is fully justified by the frequent recurrence of names in the Herodian family (*e. g.* Antipater). The two Philips were confounded by

Jerome (*ad Matt. l. c.*); and the confusion was the more easy, because the son of Mariamne was excluded from all share in his father's possessions (τῆς διαθήκης ἐξήλειψεν) in consequence of his mother's treachery (Joseph. *B. J.* i. 30, § 7), and lived afterward in a private station.

²² Joseph. *B. J.* ii. 6, § 3; Luke iii. 1, Φιλίππου . . . τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χωρᾶς.

²³ Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 2, § 4.

²⁴ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 5, § 6.

²⁵ Καισαρεία ἢ Φιλίππου, Matt. xvi 13; Mark viii. 27.

²⁶ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 5, § 6.

to Augustus, is distinguished not only by the unrivaled beauty of its site, but also by its sacred associations. "As it is the northernmost frontier of Palestine, so it is the northernmost limit of the journeys of our Lord. . . . It must at least have been in its neighborhood that the confession of Peter was made; the rock on which the temple of Augustus stood, and from which the streams of the Jordan issue, may possibly have suggested the words which now run round the dome of St. Peter's."²⁷

§ 5. Judæa, including Samaria, was reduced, on the banishment of Archelaus, to an ordinary Roman province under a procurator subordinate to the prefect of Syria.²⁸ He resided, not at Jerusalem, but at Cæsarea on the coast.²⁹ SABINUS had already held the office during the absence of Archelaus, on whose deposition COPONIUS accompanied Quirinus to the country. Quirinus (the Cyrenius of the N. T.)—now for the second time prefect of Syria³⁰—was charged with the unpopular measure of the enrolment or assessment of the inhabitants of Judæa. Notwithstanding the riots which took place elsewhere, at Jerusalem the enrolment was allowed to proceed without resistance, owing to the prudence of Joazar, again high-priest for a short time. One of the first acts of the new governor had been to take formal possession of the state vestments of the high-priest, worn on the three Festivals and on

²⁷ Matt. xvi. 13; Mark viii. 27; Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 399. Denn Stanley suggests that the "high mountain," on which the Transfiguration took place six days later, may have been Hermon, which towers above the sources of the Jordan, and is the only mountain that deserves the name in Palestine.

²⁸ A *procurator* (ἐπιτροπος, Philo, *Leg. ad Cuium*, and Joseph. *B. J.* ii. 9, § 2; but less correctly ἡγεμὼν, Matt. xxvii. 2; and Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 3, § 1) was generally a Roman knight, appointed to act under the governor of a province as collector of the revenue, and judge in causes connected with it. Strictly speaking, *procuratores Cæsaris* were required only in the imperial provinces, i. e., those which, according to the constitution of Augustus, were reserved for the special administration of the emperor, without the intervention of the senate or the people, and governed

by his legate. In the senatorian provinces, governed by proconsuls, the corresponding duties were discharged by quæstors. Yet it appears that sometimes *procuratores* were appointed in those provinces also to collect certain dues of the *fiscus* (the emperor's special revenue), as distinguished from those of the *ærarium* (the revenue administered by the senate). Sometimes in a small territory, especially in one contiguous to a larger province and dependent upon it, the procurator was head of the administration, and had full military and judicial authority, though he was responsible to the governor of the neighboring province. For the governors of Syria see *Notes and Illustrations*.

²⁹ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 3, § 1.

³⁰ Concerning the vexed question of his first prefecture, see *Notes and Illustrations* to Chap. VI.

the Day of Atonement. Since the building of the Baris by the Maccabees these robes had always been kept there, a custom continued since its reconstruction by Herod. But henceforward they were to be put up after use in an underground stone chamber, under the seal of the priests, and in charge of the captain of the guard. Seven days before use they were brought out, to be consigned again to the chamber after the ceremony was over.³¹

Two incidents at once most opposite in their character, and in their significance to that age and to ourselves, occurred during the procuratorship of Coponius. First, in the year 8, the finding of Christ in the Temple. Annas had been made high-priest about a year before. The second occurrence must have been a most distressing one to the Jews, unless they had become inured to such things. But of this we can not so exactly fix the date. It was nothing less than the pollution of the Temple by some Samaritans, who secretly brought human bones and strewed them about the cloisters during the night of the Passover.³² Up to this time the Samaritans had been admitted to the Temple; they were henceforth excluded.

In or about A.D. 10 Coponius was succeeded by M. AMBIVIVUS, and he by ANNIUS RUFUS. In A.D. 14 the emperor Augustus died, and with Tiberius came in a new procurator, VALERIUS GRATUS, who held office till 26, when he was replaced by PONTIUS PILATUS. During this period the high-priests had been numerous,³³ but it is only necessary here to say that when Pilate arrived at his government the office was held by JOSEPH CAIAPHAS, who had been appointed but a few months before. The name of Pilate indicates that he was connected, by descent or adoption, with the *gens* of the Pontii, first conspicuous in Roman history in the person of C. Pontius Telesinus, the great Samnite general.³⁴ He was the sixth Roman procurator of Judæa, and under him our Lord worked, suffered, and died, as we learn not only from the obvious Scriptural authorities, but from Tacitus,³⁵—"Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio adfectus erat."³⁶ The

³¹ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 4, § 3.

³² The mode of pollution adopted by Josiah toward the idolatrous shrines.

³³ Their names and succession will be found in the *O. T. History*, Appendix to Book III. § 3, *Notes and Ill.*

³⁴ The cognomen Pilatus has received two explanations. (1) As armed with the *pilum* or javelin;

comp. "pilata agmina," *Virg. Æn.* xii. 121. (2) As contracted from *pileatus*. The fact that the *pileus* or cap was the badge of manumitted slaves (comp. Suetonius, *Nero*, c. 57, *Tiber.* c. 4), makes it probable that the epithet marked him out as a *libertus*, or as descended from one.

³⁵ *Ann.* xv. 44.

³⁶ Of the early history of Pilate we

freedom from disturbance, which marks the preceding twenty years at Jerusalem, was probably due to the absence of the Roman troops, who were quartered at Cæsarea, out of the way of the fierce fanatics of the Temple. But Pilate transferred the winter-quarters of the army to Jerusalem,³⁷ and the very first day there was a collision. The offense was given by the Roman standards—the images of the emperor and of the eagle—which by former commanders had been kept out of the city. Pilate had been obliged to send them in by night, and there were no bounds to the rage of the people on discovering what had thus been done. They poured down in crowds to Cæsarea, where the procurator was then residing, and besought him to remove the images. After five days of discussion, he gave the signal to some concealed soldiers to surround the petitioners and to put them to death unless they ceased to trouble him; but this only strengthened their determination, and they declared themselves ready rather to submit to death than forego their resistance to an idolatrous innovation. Pilate then yielded, and the standards were by his orders brought down to Cæsarea.³⁸ Afterward, as if to try how far he might go, he consecrated some gilt shields—not containing figures, but inscribed simply with the name of the deity and of the donor—and hung them in the palace at Jerusalem. This act again aroused the resistance of the Jews; and on appeal to Tiberius they were removed.³⁹ Another riot was caused by his appropriation of the Corban—a sacred revenue arising from the redemption of vows⁴⁰—to the cost of an aqueduct which he constructed for bringing water to the city.⁴¹ To these specimens of his administration, which rest on the testimony of profane authors, we must add the slaughter of certain Galileans, already noticed in § 3. The clear testimony thus borne to his sanguinary tyranny sets in a striking light the meanness of his attempt to conciliate the

know nothing; but a German legend fills up the gap strangely enough. Pilate is the bastard son of Tyrus, king of Mayence. His father sends him to Rome as a hostage. There he is guilty of a murder; but, being sent to Pontus, rises into notice as subduing the barbarous tribes there, receives in consequence the new name of Pontius, and is sent to Judæa. It has been suggested that the twenty-second legion, which was in Palestine at the time of the destruc-

tion of Jerusalem, and was afterward stationed at Mayence, may have been in this case either the bearers of the tradition or the inventors of the fable.

³⁷ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 3, § 1.

³⁸ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 3, § 1, 2; *B. J.* ii. 9.

³⁹ Philo, *πρὸς Γαίον*, Mangey, ii. 589.

⁴⁰ Comp. Mark vii. 11.

⁴¹ Joseph. *B. J.* ii. 9, § 4.

Jews, and avoid the threat of a denunciation to Cæsar, by the sacrifice of Jesus. Of the great events of our Lord's ministry, under the government of Pilate, we shall speak in the next book, which will be the proper place to notice the motives and conduct of Pilate in consenting to his death. Pilate's tyranny continued after that event, till, A.D. 37, the loud complaints of the Samaritans determined Vitellius, the prefect of Syria and father of the emperor, to send the procurator for trial to Rome. He arrived just after the death of Tiberius; and one of the praiseworthy acts which marked the beginning of Caligula's reign was his banishment to Vienna (*Vienne*) in Gaul, where a monument still bears the very doubtful title of the tomb of Pontius Pilate.⁴²

After Pilate had been recalled to Rome, Jerusalem was visited by VITELLIUS, the prefect of Syria, at the time of the Passover. This visit was connected with the war, already noticed, between Herod Antipas and the Arabian king Aretas. In consequence of the victory of the latter, Vitellius set his army in motion to attack Petra; and it was on his march that he visited Jerusalem. Besides forbearing to insult the people by the display of his standards, Vitellius conferred two great benefits on the city. He remitted the duties levied on produce, and he allowed the Jews again to have the free custody of the high-priest's vestments. He removed Caiaphas from the high-priesthood, and gave it to Jonathan, son of Annas. He then departed, apparently leaving a Roman officer⁴³ in charge of the Antonia. Vitellius was again at Jerusalem this year, probably in the autumn, with Herod the tetrarch;⁴⁴ while there he again changed the high-priest, substituting for Jonathan, Theophilus his brother. The news of the death of Tiberius and the accession of Caligula reached Jerusalem at this time; and it was the interruption thereby caused to the operations of Vitellius that emboldened Aretas to seize Damascus, a circumstance of great importance, as we shall see, in the chronology of Paul's life.⁴⁵ MARCELLUS was appointed procurator by the new emperor.

§ 6. In A.D. 40 Vitellius was superseded by P. PETRONIUS, who arrived in Palestine with an order to place in the Temple a statue of Caligula. This outrage was connected with events which throw an interesting light on the relations of the Jews, in their various branches, to the imperial su-

⁴² Concerning the legend which connects his fate with Mons Pilatus, above the Lake of Lucerne, and the other legends of the apocryphal "Acts of Pilate," see the *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.

⁴³ *φρούραρχος*, *Ant.* xviii. 4, § 3.

⁴⁴ *Ant.* xviii. 5, § 3. ⁴⁵ See Book III.

premaey. "Up to the reign of Caligula," "says Dean Milman, "the Jews had enjoyed, without any serious interruption, the universal toleration which Roman policy permitted to the religion of the subject states. If the religion had suffered a temporary proscription at Rome under Tiberius, it was as a foreign superstition, supposed, from the misconduct of individuals, to be dangerous to the public morals in the metropolis. Judaism remained undisturbed in the rest of the empire; and, although the occasional insolence of the Roman governors in Judæa might display itself in acts offensive to the religious feelings of the natives, yet the wiser and more liberal, like Vitellius, studiously avoided all interference with that superstition which they respected or despised. But the insane vanity of Caligula made him attempt to enforce from the whole empire those divine honors, which his predecessors consented to receive from the willing adulation of their subjects. Everywhere statues were raised and temples built in honor of the deified emperor. The Jews could not submit to the mandate without violating the first principle of their religion, nor resist it without exposing their whole nation to the resentment of their masters. The storm began to lower around them: its first violence broke upon the Jews in Alexandria, where, however, the collision with the ruling authorities first originated in the animosities of the Greek and Jewish factions which divided the city. This great and populous capital, besides strangers from all quarters, was inhabited by three distinct races, the native Egyptians, Jews, and Greeks. The native Egyptians were generally avoided as of an inferior class; but the Jews boasted of edicts from the founder of the city, and from other monarchs of Egypt, which entitled them to equal rank and estimation with descendants of the ancient Macedonian settlers. They were numerous: Philo calculates that in Egypt they amounted to a million of souls." They were opulent and among the most active traders of that great commercial metropolis. It is probable that they were turbulent, and not the peaceful and unoffending people de-

⁴⁶ The proper name of this emperor — by which he is always called by the chief Roman historians, as well as in official documents — was Caius Cæsar. *Caligula* (*little boot*) was a nickname due to the humorous fondness of the soldiers, with whom he lived as a child in the camp of his father Germanicus. But it seems not

an inappropriate accident which has affixed a mere nickname, in the page of history, to a mad prince of whom a Gaul said to his face — "I think you a great absurdity."

⁴⁷ This included the Jews in Alexandria, and scattered settlers up to the borders of Ethiopia.

scribed by their advocate Philo—at all events they were odious to the Greek population.”

The prefect Valerius Flaccus, whose firm and impartial government had hitherto kept the peace between the contending factions, finding his position endangered upon the accession of Caligula, sought to ingratiate himself with the Alexandrian Greeks by giving them license to insult the Jews. The arrival of Herod Agrippa, on his way to assume the principality conferred on him by Caligula, furnished a butt for their insolence; and, having vented their wanton humor in a mockery of his royal state, they proceeded, on his departure, to more serious outrages. They set up statues of the emperor in the *proseuchæ* or Jewish places of worship; and the Jews, compelled by an edict of Flaccus to keep themselves within the two quarters of the city which were peopled exclusively by them, though many resided in the other three, lost heavily by the compulsory removal, and began to suffer from pestilence and famine in the crowded quarters in which they were almost besieged. “Those who ventured out into the market were robbed, insulted, maltreated, pursued with sticks and stones. Bloodshed soon ensued; many were slain with the sword, others trampled to death; some, even while alive, were dragged by their heels through the streets. When dead, their bodies were still dragged along till they were torn to pieces, or so disfigured that they could not be distinguished if at length recovered by their friends. Those who strayed out of the city to breathe the purer air of the country, or the strangers who incautiously entered the walls to visit and relieve their friends, were treated in the same way, and beaten with clubs till they were dead. The quays were watched, and, on the landing of a Jewish vessel, the merchandise was plundered, the owners and their vessel burned. Their houses were likewise set on fire, and whole families, men, women, and children, burned alive. Yet even this was a merciful death, compared with the sufferings of others. Sometimes, from want of wood, their persecutors could collect only a few wet sticks, and over these, stifled with smoke, and half-consumed, the miserable victims slowly expired. Sometimes they would mock their sufferings by affected sorrow; but if any of their own relatives or friends betrayed the least emotion, they were seized, scourged, tortured, or even crucified.”

When these outrages had reached their height, Flaccus summoned before his tribunal, not the perpetrators, but the victims; and thirty-eight of the chiefs of the Alexandrian Sanhedrim were publicly scourged in the theatre, many dying under the blows

The survivors were cast into prison; and many other Jews were seized and crucified. "It was the morning spectacle of the theatre, to see the Jews scourged, tortured both with the rack and with pulleys, and then led away to execution; and to this horrible tragedy immediately succeeded farces and dances, and other theatrical amusements." All this time Flaccus was keeping back a loyal address, which the Alexandrian Jews had drawn up by the advice of Agrippa, who, discovering the fraud, sent a copy to the emperor. A centurion was sent to arrest Flaccus. He was banished, and, after enduring much suffering and contempt in exile, was at length put to a cruel death.

The preceding narrative, so strikingly illustrative of the condition of one branch of the Hebrew race, is furnished by Philo, the celebrated Alexandrian Jew, who brought the philosophic principles of Neo-Platonism to the defense of the ancient faith. If he may be reasonably suspected of exaggerating the sufferings and especially the submissive temper of his countrymen, there seems no reason for doubting his graphic account of the mission which he headed to Caligula, to whom the Greeks also sent a deputation headed by Apion, a name celebrated by Josephus's refutation of his book against the Jews. They arrived just at the time when Caligula, incensed at the destruction of an altar which one of the Roman *publicani* had erected to the emperor at Jamnia, had issued the edict for the erection of his own colossal statue in the Holy of Holies, and the dedication of the Temple to himself in the character of Jupiter; and this blow at the chief sanctuary of their religion seemed fatal to their own cause. Nevertheless Caius received them with a favor, in which it soon appeared that contempt was the chief element. The celebrated interview narrated by Philo exhibits probably the prevalent feeling of the Romans toward the Jews, though distorted into peculiar grotesqueness by the emperor's insane levity. It is thus related by the eloquent historian of the Jews:—"After a long and wearisome attendance, the deputies were summoned to a final audience. To judge so grave a cause, as Philo complains with great solemnity, the emperor did not appear in a public court, encircled by the wisest of his senators; the embassy was received in the apartments of two contiguous villas in the neighborhood of Rome, called after Lamia and Mæcenas. The bailiffs of these villas were commanded at the same time to have all the rooms thrown open for the emperor's inspection. The Jews entered, made a profound obeisance, and saluted Caligula as Augustus and Emperor—but

the sarcastic smile on the face of Caius gave them little hopes of success. 'You are then'—he said, showing his teeth as he spoke—'those enemies of the gods who alone refuse to acknowledge my divinity, but worship a deity whose name you dare not pronounce'—and here, to the horror of the Jews, he uttered the awful name. The Greek deputies from Alexandria, who were present, thought themselves certain of their triumph, and began to show their exultation by insulting gestures; and Isidore, one of the accusers of Flaccus, came forward to aggravate the disobedience of the Jews. He accused them of being the only nation who had refused to sacrifice to the emperor. The Jews with one voice disclaimed the calumny, and asserted that they had three times offered sacrifice for the welfare of the emperor—and indeed had been the first to do so on his accession. 'Be it so,' rejoined the emperor—'ye have sacrificed *for* me, but not *to* me.' The Jews stood aghast and trembling. On a sudden Caius began to run all over the house, up stairs and down stairs; inspecting the men's and women's apartments; finding fault and giving orders, while the poor Jews followed him from room to room, amid the mockery of the attendants. After he had given his orders, the emperor suddenly turned round to them: 'Why is it that you do not eat pork?' The whole court burst into peals of laughter. The Jews temperately replied, that different nations had different usages: some persons would not eat lamb. 'They are right,' said the emperor, 'it is an insipid meat.' After further trial of their patience, he demanded, with his usual abruptness, on what they grounded their right of citizenship. They began a long and grave legal argument; but they had not proceeded far, when Caius began to run up and down the great hall, and to order that some blinds, of a kind of transparent stone, like glass, which admitted the light, and excluded the heat and air, should be put up against the windows. As he left that room, he asked the Jews, with a more courteous air, if they had any thing to say to him; they began again their harangue, in the middle of which he started away into another chamber, to see some old paintings. The ambassadors of the Jews at length were glad to retreat, and felt happy to escape with their lives. Caius gave them their dismissal in these words:—'Well, after all, they do not seem so bad; but rather a poor foolish people, who can not believe that I am a god.'"

Whatever the Alexandrian Jews may have gained from the contemptuous forbearance and mad humor of the despot, there was no relenting of his purpose to desecrate the temple

at Jerusalem; and he directed two legions to be withdrawn from the Euphrates, if necessary, to put down resistance. Petronius reluctantly ordered the statue to be made by Sidonian workmen, while he communicated his master's intentions to the Jews. The news had no sooner spread, than the people, without distinction of rank, age, or sex, flocked in thousands, though unarmed, to the winter-quarters of the governor at Ptolemais, to let him know that they dreaded the wrath of God more than that of the emperor. The like scene was repeated, when Petronius removed his head-quarters to Tiberias, to gain more certain information of the state of the country. When he replied to their supplications by asking them, "Are ye resolved, then, to wage war against your emperor?" they all fell on their faces to the earth, exclaiming, "We have no thought of war, but we will submit to be massacred rather than infringe our Law." For forty days they remained as suppliants before the prefect, neglecting the season for sowing, till he became alarmed lest a famine should drive the people to robbery. Petronius announced to an assembly convened at Tiberias his resolution to postpone the work till he had further orders from Rome. The influence of Agrippa with Caligula obtained the suspension of the decree; and the tyrant was preparing to vent his mortification upon Petronius, when the dagger of Cassius Chærea delivered the empire from the daily dread of some new excess of madness (A.D. 41).⁴⁸

§ 7. When the body of Caligula was left by his assassins in the dark corridor between the palace and the amphitheatre, the only man who protected it from insult was the Jewish prince, whose name has been more than once mentioned. This was HEROD AGRIPPA I.,⁴⁹ the son of Aristobulus and Berenice, and grandson of Herod the Great. He was sent to Rome on his father's execution, and was brought up with Drusus the son of Tiberius. On the death of Drusus, he found himself excluded from the emperor's presence, and was

⁴⁸ Dean Milman, whose admirable account of these events, based on Philo and Josephus, has been followed in the above narrative, adds an interesting sketch of the sufferings to which, even beyond the confines of the Roman Empire, the Babylonian Jews were exposed from the usually tolerant Parthians, in consequence of the revolt of the brothers Asinai and Anilai. The insurgents, after

considerable successes, were driven into Seleucia, where 50,000 Jews are said to have been massacred. Such details are of peculiar value, as showing the condition of the various branches of the Jewish nation in the age immediately succeeding their rejection of the Messiah.

⁴⁹ The "king Herod" of Acts xii and the Agrippa I. of Josephus.

besides overwhelmed with debt. Returning to Palestine, he obtained through his sister Herodias the protection of Herod Antipas, who made him governor of Tiberias. But a quarrel soon took place, and, after strange vicissitudes and adventures, Agrippa obtained a loan from the Alabarch of Alexandria, which enabled him to return to Italy. He attached himself to the young Caius (Caligula), and having been overheard to express a hope for his friend's speedy succession, he was thrown into prison by Tiberius, where he remained till the accession of Caligula, A.D. 37. The new emperor gave him the governments formerly held by the tetrarchs Philip and Lysanias,⁴⁰ and bestowed on him the ensigns of royalty and other marks of favor, and he arrived in Palestine in the following year, after visiting Alexandria. The jealousy of Herod Antipas and his wife Herodias was excited by these distinctions, and they sailed to Rome in the hope of supplanting Agrippa in the emperor's favor. As we have seen, Agrippa was aware of their design, and anticipated it by a counter-charge against Antipas of treasonable correspondence with the Parthians. Antipas failed to answer the accusation, and was banished to Gaul (A.D. 39), and his dominions were added to those already held by Agrippa.

During the brief wild reign of Caligula, Agrippa continued his faithful friend, and used his influence, as we have seen, on behalf of the Jews. Having paid the last honors to his patron's remains, he smoothed the path of his successor to the throne by his activity and discretion in carrying messages between the Senate and the prætorian camp. CLAUDIUS rewarded him with the kingdom of Judæa and Samaria, in addition to his tetrarchy, and thus the dominions of Herod the Great were reunited under his grandson (A.D. 41). We must doubtless ascribe to the emperor's philosophic spirit, as well as to his favor for Agrippa, his edict for the toleration of the Jewish religion, the reality of which was proved by the punishment inflicted by Petronius on the inhabitants of Dora for insulting a Jewish synagogue.

Agrippa arrived in Palestine to take possession of his kingdom, and one of his first acts was to visit the Temple, where he offered sacrifice, and dedicated the golden chain which the late emperor had presented him after his release from captivity. It was hung over the Treasury. Simon was made high-priest; and the house-tax was remitted. Unlike the other

⁴⁰ Lysanias was a native prince, tetrarch of Abilene, the district round Abila, on the east slope of Antilibanus.

See *Dict. of Bible*, art. ABILENE and LYSANIAS.

princes of his family, Agrippa was a strict observer of the Law, and he sought with success the favor of the Jews. He resided very much at Jerusalem, and added materially to its prosperity and convenience.

The city had for some time been extending itself toward the north, and a large suburb had come into existence on the high ground north of the Temple, and outside the "second wall" which enclosed the northern part of the great central valley of the city. Hitherto the outer portion of this suburb—which was called Bezetha, or "New town," and had grown up very rapidly—was unprotected by any formal wall, and practically lay open to attack.⁶¹ This defenseless condition attracted the attention of Agrippa, who, like the first Herod, was a great builder, and he commenced enclosing it in so substantial and magnificent a manner as to excite the suspicions of the prefect of Syria, Vibius Marsus, at whose instance the work was stopped by Claudius.⁶² Subsequently the Jews seem to have purchased permission to complete the work.⁶³ This new wall, the outermost of the three which enclosed the city on the north, started from the old wall at the Tower Hippicus, near the N.W. corner of the city. It ran northward, bending by a large circuit to the east, and at last returning southward along the western brink of the valley of Kedron, till it joined the southern wall of the Temple. Thus it enclosed not only the new suburb, but also the district immediately north and north-east of the Temple on the brow of the Kedron valley, which up to the present date had lain open to the country. The huge stones which still lie—many of them undisturbed—in the east and south walls of the Haram area, especially the south-east corner under the "Bath and Cradle of Jesus," are parts of this wall.

The year 44 began with the murder of St. James by Agrippa,⁶⁴ a deed expressly ascribed to his desire to please the Jews, followed at the Passover by the imprisonment and escape of St. Peter. The exercise of the power of life and death shows that, though Agrippa's power was entirely dependent on the emperor's pleasure, it could scarcely be called nominal; but Josephus expressly calls it an illegal assumption of a power that belonged only to the Roman procurator. It

⁶¹ The statements of Josephus are not quite reconcilable. In one passage he says distinctly that Bezetha lay quite naked (*B. J.* v. 4, § 2), in another that it had some kind of wall (*Ant.* xix. 7, § 2).

⁶² *Ant.* *ibid.* ; *B. J.* ii. 11, § 6, v. 4, § 2.

⁶³ *Tacit. Hist.* v. 12 ; *Jos. B. J.* v. 4, § 2, *ad fin.*

⁶⁴ *Acts* xii. 1.

Mithridates to that of Pontus, as well as Agrippa to the throne of Herod. The dependent prince was probably acting in the spirit of the emperor, when he assembled five neighboring kings at a magnificent entertainment at Tiberias; his brother Herod, king of Chalcis; Antiochus, king of Com-magene; Cotys, king of the Lesser Armenia; Sampsigera-nus,⁵⁵ king of Emesa; and Polemon, king of Pontus: and, when Vibius Marsus, jealous of the meeting, ordered the kings back to their territories, Agrippa had the boldness to write to Claudius, soliciting the prefect's recall.

Nature had secured for Agrippa the inheritance of at least one part of the greatness of Solomon. Now, as then, the maritime cities of Phœnicia depended for their corn upon the produce of the fertile plain districts of Palestine:—"Their country was nourished by the king's country."⁵⁶ The vast influence which he thus exerted is proved by the humility with which the Tyrians and Sidonians deprecated his resentment; and the pomp amid which he received their envoys at Cæsarea, indicating a desire to assume all the greatness of his grandfather, only made the likeness of their deaths the more conspicuous.

In the fourth year of his reign over the whole of Judæa (A.D. 44) Agrippa celebrated some games at Cæsarea in honor of the emperor.⁵⁷ When he appeared in the theatre on the second day in a royal robe made entirely of silver stuff, which shone in the morning light, his flatterers saluted him as a god; and suddenly he was seized with terrible pains, and being carried from the theatre to the palace, died after five days' agony a loathsome death, like those of the great persecutors, Antiochus Epiphanes, and his own grandfather. "After being racked for five days with intestine pains," "he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost." (A.D. 44.)⁵⁸ The miraculous

⁵⁵ This uncouth name, doubtless hereditary, is interesting as having furnished Cicero with a nickname for Pompey on his return from Syria.

⁵⁶ Acts xii. 20.

⁵⁷ Various conjectures have been made as to the occasion of the festival. Josephus says that it was "in behalf of the emperor's safety," and it has been supposed that it might be in connection with his return from Britain; but this is at least very uncertain. Josephus mentions also the concourse "of the chief men

throughout the province" who were present on the occasion; and though he does not notice the embassy of the Tyrians and Agrippa's speech, yet his narrative is perfectly consistent with both facts.

⁵⁸ Joseph. *Ant.* xix. 8: ἐφ' ἡμέρας πέντε τῷ τῆς γαστρὸς ἀλγέματι διεργασθεὶς τὸν βίον κατέστρεψεν. Acts xii. 23: γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν; cf. 2 Macc. ix. 5-9.

By a singular and instructive confusion Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 10; cf. Heinichen, *Exc.* 2, ad loc.) converts

and judicial character of his death is distinctly affirmed by the sacred historian:—"Immediately the *angel of the Lord* smote him, *because he gave not God the glory.*" The Greeks of Sebaste and Cæsarea, with his own soldiers, showed brutal exultation at his death, and the censure which the riot brought down from Claudius upon the Roman soldiers embittered their feelings toward the Jews to such a degree, that Josephus regards this as one of the chief causes of the Jewish war.

§ 8. HEROD AGRIPPA II.,⁸⁰ the son of Herod Agrippa I., was at Rome when his father died. He was only seventeen years old, and Claudius made his youth a reason for not giving him his father's kingdom, as he had intended.⁸¹ The emperor afterward gave him the kingdom of Chalcis (A.D. 50), which was vacant by the death of his uncle Herod (A.D. 48); and this was soon exchanged for the tetrarchies of Ituræa and Abilene, to which Nero added certain cities of the Decapolis about the Lake of Galilee (A.D. 52). But beyond the limits of his own dominions, Agrippa was permitted to exercise throughout Judæa that influence which even Paul recognized as welcome to a Jew, who saw in him the last scion of the Asmonæan house. In particular, he succeeded to those (as we should now say) ecclesiastical functions which the tolerant policy of Rome had permitted his uncle Herod to exercise—the government of the Temple and the nomination of the high-priest. He was, as we learn from the same authority, "expert in all customs and questions which are among the Jews;" and so well able to understand the Jewish Scriptures, that the Apostle's reasonings from them called forth his memorable confession, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."⁸² He gratified his hereditary taste for magnificence by adorning Jerusalem and Berytus with costly buildings; but in such a manner as mortally to offend the Jews;⁸³ and his relations to his sister Berenice (or Bernice), the widow of his uncle Herod, were of a very doubtful character.⁸⁴ But his one leading principle was to preserve fidelity to Rome. His

the owl, which, according to Josephus, appeared to Herod as a messenger of evil (*ἄγγελος κακῶν*) into "the angel" of the Acts, who was the unseen minister of the Divine Will (Acts xii. 23, *ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος Κυρίου*; cf. 2 K. xix. 35, LXX.).

⁸⁰ Called Agrippa by Josephus, and

"king Agrippa," in Acts xxv., xxvi., as a title of honor.

⁸¹ Joseph. *Ant.* xix. 9, §§ 1, 2.

⁸² Acts xxvi. 8, 26-28.

⁸³ Joseph. xx. 7, § 8.

⁸⁴ Acts xxv. 23; Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 6, § 3; Juvenal, Sat. vi. 155 seq. Scandal also connected the name of the princess with Titus, the "*deliciae humani generis.*"

sister, Drusilla, was married to Felix, the procurator of Judæa under Claudius and Nero; and the narrative of St. Paul's trial shows Agrippa's intimacy with Festus, the successor of Felix. In the last great rebellion of Judæa, he took part with Rome. With the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), an end was put to this last Jewish principality. Retaining, however, his empty title as king, Agrippa survived the fate of his country in the enjoyment of splendid luxury, retired to Rome with Berenice, and died there in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 100). Of the other members of Herod's house, it is needless to say more than appears in the genealogical table.

§ 9. Shortly after the death of Herod Agrippa I., CUSPIUS FADUS arrived from Rome as procurator, under Longinus as prefect of Syria. An attempt was made by the Romans to regain possession of the pontifical robes; but on reference to the emperor the attempt was abandoned. In A.D. 45 commenced a severe famine, which lasted two years. To the people of Jerusalem it was alleviated by the presence of Helena, queen of Adiabene, a convert to the Jewish faith, who visited the city in 46 and imported corn and dried fruit, which she distributed to the poor.⁶⁴ During her stay Helena constructed, at a distance of three stadia from the city, a tomb marked by three pyramids, to which her remains, with those of her son, were afterward brought. It was situated to the north, and formed one of the points in the course of the new wall. This famine furnishes one of the chief data of the chronology of the Acts, in the journey of Paul and Barnabas, bringing the contributions for the poor Christians at Jerusalem, which had been collected at Antioch in consequence of the prediction of the famine by Agabus.⁶⁵

Fadus was succeeded by TIBERIUS ALEXANDER, an apostate Egyptian Jew (A.D. 46), and he by VENTIDIUS CUMANUS (A.D. 48 or 50). A frightful tumult happened at the Passover of this year, caused, as on former occasions, by the presence of the Roman soldiers in the Antonia, and in the courts and cloisters of the Temple, during the festival. Ten, or, according to another account, twenty thousand are said to have met their deaths, not by the sword, but trodden to death in the crush through the narrow lanes which led from the Temple down into the city.⁶⁶ After other outrages, Cumanus was recalled to Rome, where Agrippa's influence procured his

⁶⁴ *Ant.* xx. 2, § 5; 5, § 2.

⁶⁵ *Acts* xi. 28-30.

⁶⁶ *Ant.* xx. 5, § 3; *B. J.* ii. 12, § 1.

banishment (A.D. 53), and FELIX was appointed in his room,⁶⁷ partly at the instance of Jonathan, the then high-priest.⁶⁸ The hatred of Claudius to "foreign superstition" had meanwhile been vented in an edict banishing the Jews from Rome (A.D. 52). Felix ruled the province in a mean, cruel, and profligate manner.⁶⁹ With the compendious description of Tacitus the fuller details of Josephus agree, though his narrative is tinged with his hostility to the Jewish patriots and zealots, whom, under the name of robbers, he describes Felix as extirpating and crucifying by hundreds. His period of office was full of troubles and seditions. We read of his putting down false Messiahs, the followers of an Egyptian magician, riots between the Jews and Syrians in Cæsarea, and between the priests and the principal citizens of Jerusalem. A set of ferocious fanatics, whom Josephus calls *Sicarii* (Assassins), had lately begun to make their appearance in the city, whose creed it was to rob and murder all whom they judged hostile to Jewish interests. Felix, weary of the remonstrances of Jonathan on his vicious life, employed some of these wretches to assassinate him. The high-priest was killed in the Temple, while sacrificing. The murder was never inquired into, and emboldened by this, the *Sicarii* repeated their horrid act; thus adding, in the eyes of the Jews, the awful crime of sacrilege to that of murder.⁷⁰ The city, too, was filled with impostors pretending to inspiration, but inspired only with hatred to all government and order. Nor was the disorder confined to the lower classes: the chief people of the city, the very high-priests themselves, robbed the threshing-floors of the tithes common to all the priests, and

⁶⁷ *Ant.* xx. 7, § 1; *B. J.* ii. 12, § 8.

⁶⁸ *Ant.* xx. 8, § 5. Φηλιξ, Acts xxiii., xxiv.; in Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 9, called Antonius Felix; in Suidas, Claudius Felix, for he had been the emperor's freedman; in Josephus and the Acts, simply Felix: so also in Tacitus (*Ann.* xii. 54). Tacitus states that Felix and Cumanus were joint procurators, Cumanus having Galilee, and Felix Samaria. In this account Tacitus is directly at issue with Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 6, § 2-7; § 1), and is generally supposed to be in error; but his account is very circumstantial, and by adopting it we should gain some little justification for the expression of St. Paul, Acts xxiv. 10, that Felix had

been judge of the nation "for many years." Those words, however, must not even thus be closely pressed; for Cumanus himself only went to Judæa in the eighth year of Claudius (*Jos. Ant.* xx. 5, § 2). Felix was the brother of Claudius's powerful freedman Pallas (*B. J.* ii. 12, § 8; *Ant.* xx. 7, § 1); and it was to the circumstance of Pallas's influence surviving his master's death (*Tacit. Ann.* xiv. 65) that Felix was retained in his procuratorship by Nero.

⁶⁹ "Per omnem sævitiam et libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit" (*Tacit. Hist.* v. 9, and *Ann.* xii. 54.)

⁷⁰ *B. J.* ii. 13, § 3; *Ant.* *ibid.*

led parties of rioters to open tumult and fighting in the streets."⁷¹ In fact, not only Jerusalem, but the whole country far and wide, was in the most frightful confusion and insecurity, and, though want of vigor was not among the faults of Felix, his severe measures and cruel retributions seemed only to accelerate the already rapid course of the Jews to ruin."⁷² His detention of St. Paul in prison, in the hope of extorting money, adds to the traits of tyranny the baseness of the freedman. Tacitus says, in one word, "By every form of cruelty and lust, he wielded the power of a king in the spirit of a slave."⁷³ Such were the crimes that weighed on the conscience of the Apostle's judge—dreading the vengeance of his earthly master, while he had learned something of higher principles from his Jewish wife, Drusilla. No wonder that, as Paul "reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and *judgment to come*, Felix trembled."⁷⁴ His crowning outrage was a massacre of the Jews at Cæsarea, on the occasion of one of their frequent conflicts with the Greeks. For this he was accused before Nero, after his recall (A.D. 60); but the party of his brother Pallas had still influence enough to save him from punishment; while the Greeks of Cæsarea obtained an imperial decree depriving the Jewish citizens of their rights. These affairs of Cæsarea hastened the coming contest: the Greeks became more and more insulting; the Jews more and more turbulent.

In the end of A.D. 60 or the beginning of A.D. 61, PORCIUS FESTUS succeeded Felix as procurator. Festus was an able and upright officer,"⁷⁵ and at the same time conciliatory toward the Jews, as he proved in his judgment on St. Paul, whose trial took place, not at Jerusalem, but at Cæsarea."⁷⁶ In the brief period of his administration, he kept down the robbers with a strong hand, and gave the province a short breathing time. On one occasion both Festus and Agrippa came into collision with the Jews at Jerusalem. Agrippa had added an apartment to the old Asmonæan palace on the eastern brow of the Upper City, which commanded a full view into the interior of the courts of the Temple. This view the Jews intercepted by building a wall on the west side of the inner quadrangle."⁷⁷ But the wall not only intercepted Agrippa's view,

⁷¹ *Ant.* xx. 8, § 8.

⁷² *Tac. Ann.* xii. 54: "intempestivis remediis delicta accendebat."

⁷³ *Acts* xxiv. 25.

⁷⁴ *B. J.* ii. 14, § 1.

⁷⁵ *Acts* xxv., xxvi.

⁷⁶ No one in Jerusalem might build

so high that his house could overlook the Temple. It was the subject of a distinct prohibition by the Doctors. See Maimonides, quoted by Otho, *Lex. Rab.* 266. Probably this furnished one reason for so hostile a step to so friendly a person as Agrippa.

it also interfered with that from the outer cloisters, in which the Roman guard was stationed during the festivals. Both Agrippa and Festus interfered, and required it to be pulled down; but the Jews pleaded that, once built, it was a part of the Temple, and entreated to be allowed to appeal to Nero. Nero allowed their plea, but retained as hostages the high-priest and treasurer, who had headed the deputation. Agrippa appointed Joseph, called Cabi, to the vacant priesthood, in which he was shortly after succeeded by ANNAS or ANANUS, the fifth son of the Annas before whom our Lord was taken.

In 62 (probably) Festus died, and was succeeded after a time by ALBINUS. In the interval a persecution was commenced against the Christians at the instance of the new high-priest, a rigid Sadducee, and St. James and others were arraigned before the Sanhedrim.⁷⁷ They were "delivered to be stoned," but St. James at any rate appears not to have been killed till a few years later. The act gave great offense to all, and cost Annas his office, after he had held it but three months. Jesus (Joshua), the son of Damneus, succeeded him. Albinus began his rule by endeavoring to keep down the Sicarii and other disturbers of the peace; and indeed he preserved throughout a show of justice and vigor,⁷⁸ though in secret greedy and rapacious. But before his recall he pursued his end more openly, and priests, people, and governors alike seem to have been bent on rapine and bloodshed: rival high-priests headed bodies of rioters, and stoned each other, and in the words of Josephus, "all things grew from worse to worse."⁷⁹ The evils were aggravated by two occurrences—first, the release by Albinus, before his departure, of all the smaller criminals in the prisons; and secondly, the sudden discharge of an immense body of workmen, on the completion of the repairs of the Temple. An endeavor was made to remedy the latter by inducing Agrippa to rebuild the eastern cloister; but he refused to undertake a work of such magnitude, though he consented to pave the city with marble. The repairs of a part of the sanctuary that had fallen down, and the renewal of the foundations of some portions, were deferred for the present, but the materials were collected and stored in one of the courts.⁸⁰

§ 10. Bad as Albinus had been, GESSIUS FLORUS, who succeeded him in 65, was worse. In fact, even Tacitus admits that the endurance of the oppressed Jews could last no

⁷⁷ Jos. *Ant.* xx. 9, § 1.⁷⁸ *Ant.* xx. 11, § 1.⁷⁹ *Ant.* xx. 9, § 4.⁸⁰ *B. J.* v. 1, § 5.

longer.⁶¹ So great was his rapacity, that whole cities and districts were desolated, and the robbers were openly allowed to purchase immunity in plundering. At the Passover, probably in 66, when Cestius Gallus, the prefect of Syria, visited Jerusalem, the whole assembled people⁶² besought him for redress; but without effect. Florus's next attempt was to obtain some of the treasure from the Temple. He demanded seventeen talents in the name of the emperor. The demand produced a frantic disturbance, in the midst of which he approached the city with both cavalry and foot-soldiers. That night Florus took up his quarters in the royal palace—that of Herod at the N.W. corner of the city. On the following morning he took his seat on the Bema, and the high-priest and other principal people being brought before him, he demanded that the leaders of the late riot should be given up. On their refusal, he ordered his soldiers to plunder the Upper City. This order was but too faithfully carried out; every house was entered and pillaged, and the Jews driven out. In their attempt to get through the narrow streets, which lay in the valley between the Upper City and the Temple, many were caught and slain, others were brought before Florus, scourged, and then crucified. No grade or class was exempt. Jews who bore the Roman equestrian order were among the victims treated with most indignity. Queen Bernice herself—residing at that time in the Asmonæan palace in the very midst of the slaughter—was so affected by the scene, as to intercede in person and barefoot before Florus, but without avail; and in returning she was herself nearly killed, and only escaped by taking refuge in her palace and calling her guards about her. The further details of this dreadful tumult must be passed over.⁶³ Florus was foiled in his attempt to press through the old city up into the Antonia—whence he would have had nearer access to the treasures—and finding that the Jews had broken down the north and west cloisters where they joined the fortress, so as to cut off the communication, he relinquished the attempt and withdrew to Cæsarea.⁶⁴

Cestius Gallus, the prefect of Syria, now found it necessary for him to visit the city in person. He sent one of his lieutenants to announce him, but before he himself arrived events had become past remedy. Agrippa had shortly before return-

⁶¹ *Duravit patientia Judæis usque ad Gessium Florum* (*Hist.* v. 10).

⁶² Josephus says three millions in number! Three millions is very lit-

tle under the population of London with all its suburbs.

⁶³ The whole tragic story is most forcibly told by Milman (ii. 219-224).

⁶⁴ *B. J.* ii. 15, § 6.

war with Rome
 ed from Alexandria, and had done much to calm the people. At his instance they rebuilt the part of the cloister which had been demolished, and collected the tribute in arrear, but the mere suggestion from him, that they should obey Florus until he was replaced, produced such a storm that he was obliged to leave the city. The seditious party in the Temple, led by young Eleazar, son of Ananias, rejected the offerings of the Roman emperor, which had been regularly made since the time of Julius Cæsar. *This, as a direct renunciation of allegiance, was the true beginning of the war with Rome.*¹⁰ Such acts were not done without resistance from the older and wiser people. But remonstrance was unavailing, the innovators would listen to no representations. The peace party, therefore, dispatched some of their number to Florus and to Agrippa, and the latter sent 3000 horse-soldiers to assist in keeping order.

Hostilities at once began. The peace party, headed by the high-priest, and fortified by Agrippa's soldiers, threw themselves into the Upper City. The insurgents held the Temple and the Lower City. In the Antonia was a small Roman garrison. Fierce contests lasted for seven days, each side endeavoring to take possession of the part held by the other. At last the insurgents, who behaved with the greatest ferocity, and were reinforced by a number of Sicarii, were triumphant. They gained the Upper City, driving all before them—the high-priest and other leaders into vaults and sewers, the soldiers into Herod's palace. The Asmonæan palace, the high-priest's house, and the repository of the archives—in Josephus's language, "the nerves of the city"—were set on fire. Antonia was next attacked, and in two days they had effected an entrance, sabred the garrison, and burned the fortress. The balistæ and catapults found there were preserved for future use. The soldiers in Herod's palace were next besieged; but so strong were the walls, and so stout the resistance, that it was three weeks before an entrance could be effected. The soldiers were at last forced from the palace into the three great towers on the adjoining wall with great loss; and ultimately were all murdered in the most treacherous manner. The high-priest and his brother were discovered hidden in the aqueduct of the palace: they were instantly put to death. Thus the insurgents were now completely masters of both city and Temple. But they were not to remain so long. After the defeat of Cestius Gallus at Beth-horon, dissensions began to arise, and it soon

¹⁰ Joseph. B. J. ii. 17, § 2.

became known that there was still a large moderate party; and Cestius took advantage of this to advance from Scopus on the city. He made his way through Bezetha, the new suburb north of the Temple,⁶⁶ and through the wood-market, burning every thing as he went,⁶⁷ and at last encamped opposite the palace at the foot of the second wall. The Jews retired to the Upper City and to the Temple. For five days Cestius assaulted the wall without success; on the sixth he resolved to make one more attempt, this time at a different spot—the north wall of the Temple, east of, and behind, the Antonia. The Jews, however, fought with such fury from the top of the cloisters, that he could effect nothing, and when night came he drew off to his camp at Scopus. Thither the insurgents followed him, and in three days gave him one of the most complete defeats that a Roman army had ever undergone. His catapults and balistæ were taken from him, and reserved by the Jews for the final siege. This occurred on the 8th of Marchesvan (beginning of November), A.D. 66.

The war with Rome was now inevitable, and Nero, who received the news in Greece, committed its conduct to his ablest general, T. FLAVIUS VESPASIANUS (afterward the emperor), who sent his son TITUS before him. It was evident that the siege of Jerusalem was only a question of time. Ananus, the high-priest, a moderate and prudent man, took the lead; the walls were repaired, arms and warlike instruments and machines of all kinds fabricated, and other preparations made. In this attitude of expectation—with occasional diversions, such as the expedition to Ascalon, and the skirmishes with Simon Bar-Gioras—the city remained, while Vespasian was reducing the north of the country, and till the fall of Giscala (Oct. or Nov. 67), when John, the son of Levi, escaped thence to Jerusalem, to become one of the most prominent persons in the future conflict. Nor must we omit to mention here John's great rival, Joseph, the son of Matthias, who is best known by his adopted Roman name of FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, the historian of the Jews and of this war. A priest of the most illustrious descent, distinguished alike for his ascetic piety and his Hebrew and Greek learning, he was appointed by the moderate party to defend Galilee and keep down the zealots. His energy in the latter task made him a mortal enemy to John of Giscala, while his brilliant, though vain, de-

⁶⁶ It is remarkable that nothing is said of any resistance to his passage through the great wall of Agrippa which encircled Bezetha.

⁶⁷ *B. J.* v. 7, § 2.

fense of Jotapata, before which Vespasian himself was wounded, earned him the respect of the Roman chief, who attached him to his person during the war, used his services as a mediator, though to no purpose, and at last rewarded him with a grant of land in Judæa, a pension, and the Roman franchise. For the details of the war Josephus is our only authority, most unfortunately; for, besides the natural bias toward pleasing his imperial patrons, his sense of the hopelessness of the Jewish cause overcame all patriotic sympathy with resistance to intolerable oppression, and personal animosity leads him to paint the zealots in the blackest colors. Nor is it quite needless to warn the Christian reader against judging the merits of the Jewish cause by the higher ends which their doom was destined to fulfill.

From the arrival of John, two years and a half elapsed till Titus appeared before the walls of Jerusalem, which now stood alone, like a rock, out of the flood of conquest that had overwhelmed all the country. While Vespasian reduced Galilee—the Samaritans, who, making common cause with the Jews in their extremity, had gathered their whole force on Mount Gerizim, and, being compelled by thirst to surrender to Petilius Cerealis, were treacherously massacred—Trajan, the father of the emperor, took Jamnia, the frontier fortress of Judæa, and Joppa, its only port (A.D. 67). In the second campaign the Romans swept Peræa, as with the besom of destruction, and multitudes of the flying inhabitants were slaughtered and drowned at the fords of Jericho. Vespasian had reunited his forces at that city, and was preparing to advance upon Jerusalem, when the news of Nero's death suspended his operations, upon what seemed to him a higher issue than the fate of the Holy City (A.D. 68). At Alexandria, whither he had retired with Titus to await the event of the civil war in Italy, he was proclaimed emperor by his soldiers on the 1st of July, A.D. 69, and his generals at Rome secured his accession by the overthrow and death of Vitellius on the 21st of December. Vespasian did not sail from Alexandria till the following May, leaving Titus to finish the Jewish war, which had been suspended for nearly two years. The whole of that time was occupied in contests between the moderate party, whose desire was to take such a course as might yet preserve the nationality of the Jews and the existence of the city, and the Zealots or fanatics, the assertors of national independence, who scouted the idea of compromise, and resolved to regain their freedom or perish. The Zealots, being utterly unscrupulous, and resorting to massacre on the least resist-

ance, soon triumphed, and at last reigned paramount, with no resistance but such as sprang from their own internal factions. For the repulsive details of this frightful period of contention and outrage the reader must be referred to other works.⁸⁰ It will be sufficient to say that at the beginning of A.D. 70, when Titus made his appearance, the Zealots themselves were divided into two parties: that of John of Giscala and Eleazar, who held the Temple and its courts and the Antonia—8400 men; that of Simon Bar-Gioras, whose head-quarters were in the tower Phasaëlus, and who held the Upper City, from the present Cœnaculum to the Latin Convent, the Lower City in the valley, and the district where the old Acra had formerly stood, north of the Temple—10,000 men, and 5000 Idumæans, in all a force of between 23,000 and 24,000 soldiers, trained in the civil encounters of the last two years to great skill and thorough recklessness.⁸¹ The numbers of the other inhabitants, swelled as they were by the strangers and pilgrims who flocked from the country to the Passover, it is extremely difficult to determine. Tacitus, doubtless from some Roman source, gives the whole at 600,000. Josephus states that 1,100,000 perished during the siege,⁸² and that more than 40,000 were allowed to depart into the country,⁸³ in addition to an "immense number" sold to the army, and who of course form a proportion of the 97,000 "carried captive during the whole war."⁸⁴ We may therefore take Josephus's computation of the numbers at about 1,200,000. Even the smaller of these numbers seems very greatly in excess, and it can hardly have exceeded 60,000 or 70,000.

This state of the doomed city,—overcrowded with Jews, whose native passions and fervor, exasperated by the late war and exalted by the season of the Passover, doomed to be their last, were stimulated by the Zealots and inflamed by factions,—might well prepare those who knew the people for horrid deeds and more horrid sufferings. Pent up like sheep for the slaughter, they equally resembled wolves devouring one another. But the scene had a far more awful aspect, viewed in the light of ancient prophecy, as well as of Christ's recent

⁸⁰ Dean Milman's *History of the Jews*, Books xiv., xv., xvi.; and Merivale's *History of the Romans*, vi. ch. 59. Of course the materials for all modern accounts are in Josephus only, excepting the few touches—strong, but not always accurate—in the 5th book of Tacitus's *Histories*.

⁸¹ These are the numbers given by Josephus; but it is probable that they are exaggerated.

⁸² *B. J.* vi. 9, § 3: comp. v. 13, 7.

⁸³ *B. J.* vi. 8, § 2.

⁸⁴ *B. J.* vi. 9, § 3.

denunciations of woe. As they who rejected him did but "fill up the measure of their fathers," so the warnings uttered to those fathers by Moses, by Solomon, and by the prophets, were but made more pointed and more instant in our Lord's discourse at his last departure from the Temple.* But the special significance of the destruction of Jerusalem, as the fulfillment of the last great prophecy uttered under the Old Covenant, as the proof of His authority who gave it, and as "the removal of those things that are shaken that those things which can not be shaken might remain," will be best considered in their place as the climax of the first stage in the history of the Christian Church. It need only be added here, that the Christians in Jerusalem were saved by their Lord's warning from the judicial blindness of their fellow-countrymen. Taking advantage of the space before the siege was formed by Titus they departed in a body to Pella, a village of the Decapolis, beyond Jordan, which became the seat of the "Church of Jerusalem" till Hadrian permitted their return.

§ 11. Titus's force consisted of four legions, and some auxiliaries—at the outside 30,000 men. These were disposed on their first arrival in three camps—the 12th and 15th legions on the ridge of Scopus, about a mile north of the city; the 5th a little in the rear; and the 10th on the top of the Mount of Olives, to guard the road to the Jordan valley, and to shell the place (if the expression may be allowed) from that commanding position. The army was well furnished with artillery and machines of the latest and most approved invention.** The first operation was to clear the ground between Scopus and the north wall of the city—fell the timber, destroy the fences of the gardens which fringed the wall, and level the rocky protuberances. This occupied four days. After it was done, the three legions were marched forward from Scopus, and encamped off the north-west corner of the walls, stretching from the Tower Psephinus to opposite Hippicus. The first step was to get possession of the outer wall. The point of attack chosen was in Simon's portion of the city, at a low and comparatively weak place near the monument of John Hyrcanus, close to the junction of the three walls, and where the Upper City came to a level with the surrounding ground. Round this spot the three legions erected banks, from which they opened batteries, pushing up the rams and other engines of attack to the foot of the wall. One of the rams, more pow-

* Matt. xxiv. ** Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 13. See the plan of Jerusalem on p. 117

erful than the rest, went among the Jews by the sobriquet of *Nikôn*, the conqueror. Three large towers, 75 feet high, were also erected, overtopping the wall. Meantime from their camp on the Mount of Olives the 10th legion opened fire on the Temple and the east side of the city. They had the heaviest balistæ, and did great damage. Simon and his men did not suffer these works to go on without molestation. The catapults, both those taken from Cestius, and those found in Antonia, were set up on the wall, and constant desperate sallies were made. At last the Jews began to tire of their fruitless assaults. They saw that the wall must fall, and, as they had done during Nebuchadnezzar's siege, they left their posts at night, and went home. A breach was made by the redoubtable *Nikôn* on the 7th Artemisius (about April 15); and here the Romans entered, driving the Jews before them to the second wall. A great length of the wall was then broken down; such parts of Bezetha as had escaped destruction by Cestius were leveled, and a new camp was formed on the spot formerly occupied by the Assyrians, and still known as the "Assyrian camp."

This was a great step in advance. Titus now lay with the second wall of the city close to him on his right, while before him at no considerable distance rose Antonia and the Temple, with no obstacle in the interval to his attack. Still, however, he preferred, before advancing, to get possession of the second wall, and the neighborhood of John's monument was again chosen. Simon was no less reckless in assault, and no less fertile in stratagem, than before; but, notwithstanding all his efforts, in five days a breach was again effected. The district into which the Romans had now penetrated was the great Valley which lay between the two main hills of the city, occupied then, as it is still, by an intricate mass of narrow and tortuous lanes, and containing the markets of the city—no doubt very like the present bazaars. Titus's breach was where the wool, cloth, and brass bazaars came up to the wall. This district was held by the Jews with the greatest tenacity. Knowing as they did every turn of the lanes and alleys, they had an immense advantage over the Romans, and it was only after four days' incessant fighting, much loss, and one thorough repulse, that the Romans were able to make good their position. However, at last, Simon was obliged to retreat, and then Titus demolished the wall. This was the second step in the siege.

Meantime some shots had been interchanged in the direction of the Antonia, but no serious attack was made. Before

beginning there in earnest, Titus resolved to give his troops a few days' rest, and the Jews a short opportunity for reflection. He therefore called in the 10th legion from the Mount of Olives, and held an inspection of the whole army on the ground north of the Temple—full in view of both the Temple and the Upper City, every wall and house in which were crowded with spectators. But the opportunity was thrown away upon the Jews, and after four days orders were given to recommence the attack. Hitherto the assault had been almost entirely on the city: it was now to be simultaneous on city and Temple. Accordingly two pairs of large batteries were constructed, the one pair in front of Antonia; the other at the old point of attack—the monument of John Hyrcanus. The first pair was erected by the 5th and 12th legions, and was near the pool Struthius—probably the present *Birket Israil*, by the St. Stephen's gate; the second by the 10th and 15th, at the pool called the Almond pool—possibly that now known as the pool of Hezekiah—and near the high-priest's monument. These banks seem to have been constructed of timber and fascines, to which the Romans must have been driven by the scarcity of earth. They absorbed the incessant labor of seventeen days, and were completed on the 29th Artemisius (about May 7). John in the mean time had not been idle; he had employed the seventeen days' respite in driving mines, through the solid limestone of the hill, from within the fortress to below the banks. The mines were formed with timber roofs and supports. When the banks were quite complete, and the engines placed upon them, the timber of the galleries was fired, the superincumbent ground gave way, and the labor of the Romans was totally destroyed. At the other point Simon had maintained a resistance with all his former intrepidity, and more than his former success. He had now greatly increased the number of his machines, and his people were much more expert in handling them than before, so that he was able to impede materially the progress of the works. And when they were completed, and the battering rams had begun to make a sensible impression on the wall, he made a furious assault on them, and succeeded in firing the rams, seriously damaging the other engines, and destroying the banks.

It now became plain to Titus that some other measures for the reduction of the place must be adopted. It would appear that hitherto the southern and western parts of the city had not been invested, and on that side a certain amount of communication was kept up with the country, which, unless

stopped, might prolong the siege indefinitely. The number who thus escaped is stated by Josephus at more than 500 a day. A council of war was therefore held, and it was resolved to encompass the whole place with a wall, and then recommence the assault. The wall began at the Roman camp—a spot probably outside the modern north wall, between the Damascus gate and the N.E. corner; from thence it went to the lower part of Bezetha—about St. Stephen's gate; then across Kedron to the Mount of Olives; thence south, by a rock called the "Pigeon's rock,"—possibly the modern "Tombs of the Prophets"—to the Mount of Offense. It then turned to the west; again dipped into the Kedron, ascended the Mount of Evil Counsel, and so kept on the upper side of the ravine to a village called Beth-Erebenthi, whence it ran outside of Herod's monument to its starting-point at the camp. Its entire length was 39 furlongs—very near 5 miles; and it contained 13 stations or guard-houses. The whole strength of the army was employed on the work, and it was completed in the short space of three days. The siege was then vigorously pressed. The north attack was relinquished, and the whole force concentrated on the Antonia. Four new banks of greater size than before were constructed, and as all the timber in the neighborhood had been already cut down, the materials had to be procured from a distance of eleven miles. Twenty-one days were occupied in completing the banks. At length on the 1st Panemus or Tamuz (about June 7), the fire from the banks commenced, under cover of which the rams were set to work, and that night a part of the wall fell at a spot where the foundations had been weakened by the mines employed against the former attacks. Still this was but an outwork, and between it and the fortress itself a new wall was discovered, which John had taken the precaution to build. At length, after two desperate attempts, this wall and that of the inner fortress were scaled by a bold surprise, and on the 5th Panemus (June 11)⁹⁸ the Antonia was in the hands of the Romans. Another week was occupied in breaking down the outer walls of the fortress for the passage of the machines, and a further delay took place in erecting new banks, on the fresh level, for the bombardment and battery of

⁹⁸ Josephus contradicts himself about this date, since in vi. 2, § 1, he says that the 17th Panemus was the "very day" that Antonia was entered. The date given in the text agrees best with the narrative. But on the other hand the 17th is the day commemorated in the Jewish calendar. It should be observed that the Macedonian names of months are supposed to be used by Josephus for the corresponding Jewish months.

the Temple. During the whole of this time—the miseries of which are commemorated in the traditional name of *yomin deëka*, “days of wretchedness,” applied by the Jews to the period between the 17th Tamuz and the 9th Ab—the most desperate hand-to-hand encounters took place, some in the passages from the Antonia to the cloisters, some in the cloisters themselves, the Romans endeavoring to force their way in, the Jews preventing them. But the Romans gradually gained ground. First the western, and then the whole of the northern external cloister was burned (27th and 28th Panemus), and then the wall enclosing the court of Israel and the holy house itself. In the interval, on the 17th Panemus, the daily sacrifice had failed, owing to the want of officiating priests; a circumstance which had greatly distressed the people, and was taken advantage of by Titus to make a further though fruitless invitation to surrender. At length, on the 10th day of Lous or Ab (July 15),—the 9th, according to the Jewish tradition—by the wanton act of a soldier, contrary to the intention of Titus and in spite of every exertion he could make to stop it, the sanctuary itself was fired. It was, by one of those rare coincidences that sometimes occur, the very same month and day of the month that the first temple had been burned by Nebuchadnezzar. John, and such of his party as escaped the flames and the carnage, made their way by the bridge on the south to the Upper City. The whole of the cloisters that had hitherto escaped, including the magnificent triple colonnade of Herod on the south of the Temple, the treasury chambers, and the rooms round the outer courts, were now all burned and demolished. Only the edifice of the sanctuary itself still remained. On its solid masonry the fire had had comparatively little effect, and there were still hidden in its recesses a few faithful priests who had contrived to rescue the most valuable of the utensils, vessels, and spices of the sanctuary.

The Temple was at last gained; but it seemed as if half the work remained to be done. The Upper City, higher than Moriah, enclosed by the original wall of David and Solomon, and on all sides precipitous except at the north, where it was defended by the wall and towers of Herod, was still to be taken. Titus tried a parley first through Josephus, and then in person, he standing on the east end of the bridge between the Temple and the Upper City, and John and Simon on the west end. His terms, however, were rejected, and no alternative was left him but to force on the siege. The whole of the low part of the town—the crowded lanes, of which we have

so often heard—was burned, in the teeth of a frantic resistance from the Zealots, together with the council-house, the repository of the records (doubtless occupied by Simon since its former destruction), and the palace of Helena, which were situated in this quarter—the suburb of Ophel under the south wall of the Temple, and the houses as far as Siloam on the lower slopes of the Temple mount.

It took 18 days to erect the necessary works for the siege; the four legions were once more stationed at the west or north-west corner, where Herod's palace abutted on the wall, and where the three magnificent and impregnable towers of Hippicus, Phasaëlus, and Mariamne rose conspicuous. This was the main attack. Opposite the Temple, the precipitous nature of the slopes of the Upper City rendered it unlikely that any serious attempt would be made by the Jews, and this part accordingly, between the bridge and the Xystus, was left to the auxiliaries. The attack was commenced on the 7th of Gorpæus (about Sept. 11), and by the next day a breach was made in the wall, and the Romans at last entered the city. During the attack John and Simon appear to have stationed themselves in the towers just alluded to; and had they remained there, they would probably have been able to make terms, as the towers were considered impregnable. But on the first signs of the breach, they took flight, and, traversing the city, descended into the valley of Hinnom below Siloam, and endeavored to force the wall of circumvallation and so make their escape. On being repulsed there, they took refuge apart in some of the subterraneous caverns or sewers of the city. John shortly after surrendered himself; but Simon held out for several weeks, and did not make his appearance until after Titus had quitted the city. They were both reserved for the triumph at Rome.

The city being taken, such parts as had escaped the former conflagrations were burned, and the whole of both city and Temple was ordered to be demolished, excepting the west wall of the Upper City, and Herod's three great towers at the north-west corner, which were left standing as memorials of the massive nature of the fortifications.

Of the Jews, the aged and infirm were killed; the children under seventeen were sold as slaves; the rest were sent, some to the Egyptian mines, some to the provincial amphitheatres, and some to grace the triumph of the Conqueror. Titus then departed, leaving the 10th legion, under the command of Terentius Rufus, to carry out the work of demolition. Of this Josephus assures us, that 'the whole was so thoroughly lev-

eled and dug up, that no one visiting it would believe that it had ever been inhabited."

§ 12. The great interest belonging to Jerusalem as the central scene of Sacred History, and especially in connection with our Lord's prediction of the destruction of the Temple, seems to demand a few words by way of supplement. For more than fifty years after its destruction by Titus, Jerusalem disappears from history. During the revolts of the Jews in Cyrenaica, Egypt, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia, which disturbed the latter years of Trajan, the recovery of their city was never attempted. Of its annals during this period we know nothing. Three towers and part of the western wall alone remained of its strong fortifications, to protect the cohorts who occupied the conquered city; and the soldiers' huts were long the only buildings on its site. But in the reign of Hadrian it again emerged from its obscurity, and became the centre of an insurrection, which the best blood of Rome was shed to subdue. In despair of keeping the Jews in subjection by other means, the Emperor had formed a design to restore Jerusalem, and thus prevent it from ever becoming a rallying point for this turbulent race. In furtherance of his plan he had sent thither a colony of veterans, in numbers sufficient for the defense of a position so strong by nature against the then known modes of attack. To this measure Dion Cassius¹² attributes a renewal of the insurrection, while Eusebius asserts that it was not carried into execution till the outbreak was quelled. Be this as it may, the embers of revolt, long smouldering, burst into a flame soon after Hadrian's departure from the East in A.D. 132. The contemptuous indifference of the Romans, or the secrecy of their own plans, enabled the Jews to organize a wide-spread conspiracy. Bar-Cocheba, their leader, the third, according to Rabbinical writers, of a dynasty of the same name, princes of the captivity, was crowned king at Bether by the Jews who thronged to him, and by the populace was regarded as the Messiah. His armor-bearer, Rabbi Akiba, claimed descent from Sisera, and hated the Romans with the fierce rancor of his adopted nation. All the Jews in Palestine flocked to his standard. At an early period in the revolt they became masters of Jerusalem, and attempted to rebuild the Temple. Hadrian, alarmed at the rapid spread of the insurrection, and the ineffectual efforts of his troops to repress it, summoned from Britain Julius Severus, the greatest general of his time, to take the command of the

¹² lxi. 12.

army of Judæa. Two years were spent in a fierce guerrilla warfare, before Jerusalem was taken, after a desperate defense in which Bar-Cocheba perished. The courage of the defenders was shaken by the falling in of the vaults on Mount Zion, and the Romans became masters of the position. But the war did not end with the capture of the city. The Jews in great force had occupied the fortress of Bether, and there maintained a struggle with all the tenacity of despair against the repeated onsets of the Romans. At length, worn out by famine and disease, they yielded on the 9th of the month Ab, A.D. 135, and the grandson of Bar-Cocheba was among the slain. The slaughter was frightful. Five hundred and eighty thousand are said to have fallen by the sword, while the number of victims to the attendant calamities of war was countless. On the side of the Romans the loss was enormous, and so dearly bought was their victory, that Hadrian, in his letter to the Senate, announcing the conclusion of the war, did not adopt the usual congratulatory phrase. Bar-Cocheba has left traces of his occupation of Jerusalem, in coins which were struck during the first two years of the war. Four silver coins, three of them undoubtedly belonging to Trajan, have been discovered, restamped with Samaritan characters. But the rebel leader, amply supplied with the precious metals by the contributions of his followers, afterward coined his own money. The mint was probably at Jerusalem during the first two years of the war; the coins struck during that period bearing the inscription, "To the freedom of Jerusalem," or "Jerusalem the holy." They are mentioned in both Talmuds.

Hadrian's first policy, after the suppression of the revolt, was to obliterate the existence of Jerusalem as a city. The ruins which Titus had left were razed to the ground, and the plough passed over the foundations of the Temple. A colony of Roman citizens occupied the new city which rose from the ashes of Jerusalem, and their number was afterward augmented by the Emperor's veteran legionaries. A temple to the Capitoline Jupiter was erected on the site of the sacred edifice of the Jews. A temple to Astarte, the Phœnician Venus, on the site afterward identified with the Sepulchre, appears on coins, with four columns and the inscription C. A. C., *Colonia Ælia Capitolina*, but it is more than doubtful whether it was erected at this time.

It was not, however, till the following year, A.D. 136, that Hadrian, on celebrating his Vicennalia, bestowed upon the new city the name of *ÆLIA CAPITOLINA*, combining with his

own family title the name of Jupiter of the Capitol, the guardian deity of the colony. Christians and pagans alone were allowed to reside in the city. Jews were forbidden to enter it on pain of death, and this prohibition remained in force in the time of Tertullian. About the middle of the 4th century the Jews were allowed to visit the neighborhood, and afterward, once a year, to enter the city itself, and weep over it on the anniversary of its capture. Jerome¹ has drawn a vivid picture of the wretched crowds of Jews who in his day assembled at the wailing-place by the west wall of the Temple to bemoan the loss of their ancestral greatness. On the ninth of the month Ab might be seen the aged and decrepit of both sexes, with tattered garments and disheveled hair, who met to weep over the downfall of Jerusalem, and purchased permission of the soldiery to prolong their lamentations ("et miles mercedem postulat ut illis flere plus liceat"). So completely were all traces of the ancient city obliterated, that its very name was in process of time forgotten. It was not till after Constantine built the *Martyrion* on the site of the crucifixion, that its ancient appellation was revived. In the 7th canon of the Council of Nicæa the bishop of *Ælia* is mentioned; but Macarius, in subscribing to the canons, designated himself bishop of Jerusalem. The name of *Ælia* occurs as late as A. D. 697, and is even found in Edrisi and Mejr ed-Din about 1495.

After the inauguration of the new colony of *Ælia* the annals of the city again relapse into an obscurity, which is only represented in history by a list of twenty-three Christian bishops, who filled up the interval between the election of Marcus, the first of the series, and Macarius in the reign of Constantine. Already in the third century the Holy Places had become objects of enthusiasm, and the pilgrimage of Alexander, a bishop in Cappadocia, and afterward of Jerusalem, is matter of history. In the following century such pilgrimages became more common. The aged Empress Helena, mother of Constantine, visited Palestine in A.D. 326, and, according to tradition, erected magnificent churches at Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives. Her son, fired with the same zeal, swept away the shrine of Astarte, which occupied the site of the Resurrection, and founded in its stead a chapel or oratory. On the east of this was a large court, the eastern side being formed by the *Basilica*, erected on the spot where the cross was said to have been found. The latter of these build-

¹ On *Zeph.* i. 15.

ings is that known as the *Martyrion*; the former was the church of the *Anastasis*, or Resurrection. In the reign of Julian (A.D. 362) the Jews, with the permission and at the instigation of the Emperor, made an abortive attempt to lay the foundations of a temple. From whatever motive, Julian had formed the design of restoring the Jewish worship on Mount Moriah to its pristine splendor, and during his absence in the East the execution of his project was entrusted to his favorite, Alypius of Antioch. Materials of every kind were provided at the Emperor's expense, and so great was the enthusiasm of the Jews, that their women took part in the work, and in the laps of their garments carried off the earth which covered the ruins of the Temple. But a sudden whirlwind and earthquake shattered the stones of the former foundations; the workmen fled for shelter to one of the neighboring churches, the doors of which were closed against them by an invisible hand, and a fire issuing from the Temple mount raged the whole day and consumed their tools. Numbers perished in the flames. Some who escaped took refuge in a portico near at hand, which fell at night and crushed them as they slept. Whatever may have been the coloring which this story received as it passed through the hands of the ecclesiastical historians, the impartial narrative of Ammianus Marcellinus,⁸⁸ the friend and companion in arms of the Emperor, leaves no reasonable doubt of the truth of the main facts that the work was interrupted by fire, which all attributed to supernatural agency. In the time of Chrysostom the foundations of the Temple still remained, to which the orator could appeal. The event was regarded as a judgment of God upon the impious attempt of Julian to falsify the predictions of Christ: a position which Bishop Warburton defends with great skill in his treatise on the subject; but other writers of high authority regard it as a legend invented by superfluous and short-sighted zeal.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ xxiii. 1.

⁸⁹ The preceding account of the siege of Jerusalem by Titus and its

subsequent history is taken, with a few additions, from the article JERUSALEM in the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

| GOVERNORS OF SYRIA. | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| THE list of the governors of Syria, from its conquest by the Romans to the destruction of Jerusalem, has been made out with a near approach to accuracy, and is as follows: | | | | Names. | Titles of office. | Date of entering office. | Date of quitting office. |
| Names. | Titles of office. | Date of entering office. | Date of quitting office. | | | B.C. | B.C. |
| M. Æmilius Scaurus . . . | { Questor pro prætor | B.C. | B.C. | L. Calpurnius Bibulus . . . | Legatus | 31 | 31 |
| L. Marcius Philippus . . . | Prætor | 62 | 61 | Q. Didius | Legatus | 30 | |
| Lentulus Marcellinus . . . | Prætor | 59 | 57 | M. Valerius Messalla . . . | Legatus | 29 | 29 |
| Gabinius | Proconsul | 56 | 55 | Varro | Legatus | 24 | |
| Crassus | | 55 | 53 | M. Vipsanius Agrippa . . . | Legatus | 23 | 20 |
| Cassius | Questor | 53 | 51 | M. Tullius | Legatus | 19 (?) | |
| M. Calpurnius Bibulus . . . | Proconsul | 51 | 47 | M. Vipsanius Agrippa . . . | Legatus | 15 | |
| Sext. Julius Cæsar | | 47 | 46 | M. Titius | Legatus | 11 | 7 |
| Q. Cæcilius Bassus | Prætor | 46 | 44 | C. Sentius Saturninus . . . | Legatus | 7 | 3 |
| { Q. Cornificius | { received authority from the Senate to dispossess Bassus, but failed). | | | | | | A.D. |
| { L. Statius Murcus | | | | P. Quintilius Varus . . . | Legatus | 3 | 5 |
| { Q. Marcius Crispus | | | | | | | A.D. |
| C. Cassius Longinus | Proconsul | 43 | 42 | P. Sulpicius Quirinus . . . | Legatus | 5 | |
| L. Decidius Saxa | Legatus | 41 | 40 | Q. Cæcilius Metellus } . . . | Legatus | | 17 |
| P. Ventidius Bassus | Legatus | 40 | 38 | Creticus Silianus | | | |
| C. Sosius | Legatus | 38 | 35 | M. Calpurnius Piso | Legatus | 17 | 19 |
| L. Munatius Plancus | Legatus | 35 | 32 | Cn. Sentius Saturninus . . . | Prolegatus | 19 | |
| | | | | L. Pomponius Flaccus . . . | Proprætor | 22 | 23 |
| | | | | L. Vitellius | Legatus | 35 | 39 |
| | | | | P. Petronius | Legatus | 39 | 42 |
| | | | | Vibius Marsus | Legatus | 42 | 48 |
| | | | | C. Cassius Longinus | Legatus | 48 | 51 |
| | | | | T. Numidius* Quadratus . . | Legatus | 51 | 60 |
| | | | | Domitius Corbulo | Legatus | 60 | 63 |
| | | | | Cincius | Legatus | 63 | |
| | | | | C. Cestius Gallus | Legatus | 65 | 67 |
| | | | | P. Licinius Mucianus | Legatus | 67 | 69 |

* Called "Vindex" by Tacitus.

APPENDIX TO BOOK I

SECTION I.

THE SEVERAL BRANCHES OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE.

§ 1. Introduction. § 2. The JEWS OF JUDÆA. § 3. The SAMARITANS—Their origin, character, opposition to the Jews, and present state. § 4. The DISPERSION—Origin and extent. § 5. The Babylonian Dispersion. § 6. The Syrian Dispersion. § 7. Alexandrian Jews. § 8. Jews in other parts of Africa. § 9. Jews at Rome. § 10. Influence of the Dispersion upon the spread of Christianity. § 11. THE PROSELYTES.

§ 1. For the full understanding of the new ecclesiastical commonwealth, which was founded in Judæa on the return from the Captivity, and the relics of which survived even the destruction of Jerusalem, there remain certain topics, which could not be conveniently worked into the text. Among them are some of the highest importance, not only because of the direct allusions to them in the New Testament, but for the comprehension of the whole character of the Jewish nation at the time of Christ, and during the first period of the diffusion of Christianity.

§ 2. The JEWS OF JUDÆA have formed the main subject of our narrative; and it is only necessary to remind the reader that the few Jews scattered among the heathen settlers of *Northern Palestine* were recognized as belonging to the commonwealth of Israel, in a manner strikingly contrasted with the exclusion and hatred of the Samaritans.

§ 3. THE SAMARITANS. Though so jealously rejected by the Jews, from the first moment of their return, the half-heathen Samaritans demand a place in Jewish history, from their position in the very centre of Palestine, and from their own high claims of rivalry with the Jews.

The strangers, whom we have seen placed in "the cities of Samaria" by Esarhaddon, were of course idolaters, and worshiped a strange medley of divinities.¹ Each of the five nations, says Josephus, who is confirmed by the words of Scripture, had its own god. No place was found for the worship of Him who had once called the land His own, and whose it was still. God's displeasure was kindled, and they were infested by beasts of prey, which had probably increased to a great extent before their entrance upon the land. "The Lord sent lions among them, which slew some of them." On their explaining their miserable condition to the King of Assyria, he dispatched one of the captive priests to teach them "how they should fear the Lord." The priest came accordingly, and henceforth, in the language of the sacred historian, they "feared the Lord, and served their graven images, both their children and their children's children: as

¹ *Old Test. Hist.* chap. xxiv.

did their fathers, so do they unto this day.”² This last sentence was probably inserted by Ezra. It serves two purposes: 1st, to qualify the pretensions of the Samaritans of Ezra’s time to be pure worshipers of God—they were no more exclusively his servants, than was the Roman Emperor, who desired to place a statue of Christ in the Pantheon, entitled to be called a Christian; and, 2dly, to show how entirely the Samaritans of later days differed from their ancestors in respect to idolatry.³

Such was the origin of the post-captivity or new Samaritans, men not of Jewish extraction, but from the further East.⁴ Our Lord expressly terms them aliens.⁵ A gap occurs in their history, until Judah has returned from captivity. They then desire to be allowed to participate in the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. It is curious, and perhaps indicative of the treacherous character of their designs, to find them even then called by anticipation, “the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin,”⁶ a title which they afterward fully justified. But, so far as professions go, they are not enemies; they are most anxious to be friends. Their religion, they assert, is the same as that of the two tribes, therefore they have a right to share in that great religious undertaking. But they do not call it a *national* undertaking. They advance no pretensions to Jewish blood. They confess their Assyrian descent, and even put it forward ostentatiously, perhaps to enhance the merit of their partial conversion to God. That it was but partial they give no hint. It may have become purer already, but we have no information that it had. Be this, however, as it may, the Jews do not listen favorably to their overtures. Ezra, no doubt, from whose pen we have a record of the transaction, saw them through and through. On this the Samaritans throw off the mask, and become open enemies, frustrate the operations of the Jews through the reigns of two Persian kings, and are only effectually silenced in the reign of Darius Hystaspis, B.C. 519.

The feud, thus unhappily begun, grew year by year more inveterate. It is probable, too, that the more the Samaritans detached themselves from idols, and became devoted exclusively to a sort of worship of Jehovah, the more they resented the contempt with which the Jews treated their offers of fraternization. Matters at length came to a climax. About B.C. 409, a certain Manasseh, a man of priestly lineage, on being expelled from Jerusalem by Nehemiah for an unlawful marriage, obtained permission from the Persian king of his day, Darius Nothus, to build a temple on Mount Gerizim for the Samaritans, with whom he had found refuge. The only thing wanting to crystallize the opposition between the two races, viz., a rallying point for schismatical worship, being now obtained, their animosity became more intense than ever. The Samaritans are said to have done every thing in their power to annoy the Jews. They would refuse hospitality to pilgrims on their road to Jerusalem, as in our Lord’s case. They would even waylay them in their journey;⁷ and many were compelled through fear to take the longer route by the east of Jordan. Certain Samaritans were said

² 2 K. xvii. 41.

³ Josephus’s account of the distress of the Samaritans, and of the remedy devised for it, is very similar, with the exception that with him they are afflicted with pestilence.

⁴ 2 K. xvii. 24. Cuthmann, says Josephus, from the interior of Persia and Media.

⁵ ἄλλογενεῖς, Luke xvii. 18. And Jose-

phus’s whole account of them shows that he believed them to have been μέτοικοι ἄλλογενεῖς, though, as he tells us in two places (*Ant.* ix. 14, § 3, and xi. 8, § 6), they sometimes gave a different account of their origin.

⁶ Ezr. iv. 1.

⁷ Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 6, § 1.

to have once penetrated into the Temple of Jerusalem, and to have defiled it by scattering dead men's bones on the sacred pavement.⁸ We are told too of a strange piece of mockery which must have been especially resented. It was the custom of the Jews to communicate to their brethren still in Babylon the exact day and hour of the rising of the paschal moon, by beacon-fires commencing from Mount Olivet, and flashing forward from hill to hill until they were mirrored in the Euphrates. So the Greek poet represents Agamemnon as conveying the news of Troy's capture to the anxious watchers at Mycenæ. Those who "sat by the waters of Babylon" looked for this signal with much interest. It enabled them to share in the devotions of those who were in their father-land, and it proved to them that they were not forgotten. The Samaritans thought scorn of these feelings, and would not unfrequently deceive and disappoint them, by kindling a rival flame and perplexing the watchers on the mountains. Their own temple on Gerizim they considered to be much superior to that at Jerusalem. There they sacrificed a passover. Toward the mountain, even after the temple on it had fallen, wherever they were, they directed their worship. To their copy of the Law they arrogated an antiquity and authority greater than attached to any copy in the possession of the Jews. The Law (*i. e.*, the five books of Moses) was their sole code; for they rejected every other book in the Jewish canon. And they professed to observe it better than did the Jews themselves, employing the expression not unfrequently, "The Jews indeed do so and so; but we, observing the letter of the Law, do otherwise."

The Jews, on the other hand, were not more conciliatory in their treatment of the Samaritans. The copy of the Law possessed by that people they declared to be the legacy of an apostate (Manasseh), and cast grave suspicions upon its genuineness. Certain other Jewish renegades had from time to time taken refuge with the Samaritans. Hence, by degrees, the Samaritans claimed to partake of Jewish blood, especially if doing so happened to suit their interest.⁹ A remarkable instance of this is exhibited in a request which they made to Alexander the Great, about B.C. 332. They desired to be excused payment of tribute in the Sabbatical year, on the plea that as true Israelites, descendants of Ephraim and Manasseh, sons of Joseph, they refrained from cultivating their land in that year. Alexander, on cross-questioning them, discovered the hollowness of their pretensions. They were greatly disconcerted at their failure, and their dissatisfaction probably led to the conduct which induced Alexander to besiege and destroy the city of Samaria.¹⁰ Another instance of claim to Jewish descent appears in the words of the woman of Samaria to our Lord, "Art thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us this well?"¹¹—a question which she puts without recollecting that she had just before strongly contrasted the Jews and the Samaritans. Very far were the Jews from admitting this claim to consanguinity on the part of these people. They were ever reminding them that they were after all mere Cuthæans, mere strangers from Assyria. They accused them of worshiping the idol gods buried long ago under the oak of Shechem.¹² They would have no dealings with them that they could

⁸ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 2, § 2.

⁹ Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 8, § 6, ix. 14, § 3.

¹⁰ Shechem (Σικεμα) was indeed their μη-

τρόπολις, but the destruction of Samaria seems to have satisfied Alexander.

¹¹ John iv. 12.

¹² Gen. xxxv. 4.

possibly avoid.¹³ "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil," was the mode in which they expressed themselves when at a loss for a bitter reproach. Every thing that a Samaritan had touched was as swine's flesh to them. The Samaritan was publicly cursed in their synagogues—could not be adduced as a witness in the Jewish courts—could not be admitted to any sort of proselytism—and was thus, so far as the Jew could affect his position, excluded from hope of eternal life. The traditional hatred in which the Jew held him is expressed in Eccclus. i. 25, 26, "There be two manner of nations which my heart abhorreth, and the third is no nation: they that sit in the mountain of Samaria; and they that dwell among the Philistines; and that foolish people that dwell in Sichem." And so long was it before such a temper could be banished from the Jewish mind, that we find even the Apostles believing that an inhospitable slight shown by a Samaritan village to Christ would be not unduly avenged by calling down fire from heaven.

"Ye know not what spirit ye are of," said the large-hearted Son of Man, and we find him on no one occasion uttering any thing to the disparagement of the Samaritans. His words, however, and the records of his ministrations, confirm most thoroughly the view which has been taken above, that the Samaritans were not Jews. At the first sending forth of the Twelve,¹⁴ he charges them, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." So again, in his final address to them on Mount Olivet, "Ye shall be witnesses to me in Jerusalem and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."¹⁵ So the nine unthankful lepers, Jews, were contrasted by him with the tenth leper, the thankful *stranger*, who was a Samaritan. So, in his well-known parable, a merciful Samaritan is contrasted with the unmerciful priest and Levite. And the very worship of the two races is described by him as different in character. "Ye worship ye know not what," he said of the Samaritans: "We know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews."¹⁶

Such were the Samaritans of our Lord's day: a people distinct from the Jews, though lying in the very midst of the Jews; a people preserving their identity, though seven centuries had rolled away since they had been brought from Assyria by Esarhaddon, and though they had abandoned their polytheism for a sort of ultra Mosaicism; a people, who—though their limits had been gradually contracted, and the rallying place of their religion on Mount Gerizim had been destroyed one hundred and forty years before by John Hyrcanus (B.C. 109), and though Samaria (the city) had been again and again destroyed, and though their territory had been the battle-field of Syria and Egypt—still preserved nationality, still worshiped from Shechem and their other impoverished settlements toward their sacred hill; still retained their separation, and could not coalesce with the Jews. Not indeed that we must suppose that the whole of the country called in our Lord's time Samaria, was in the possession of the Cuthæan

¹³ This prejudice had, of course, sometimes to give way to necessity, for the disciples had gone to Sychar (Shechem, *Σιχμα*) to buy food, while our Lord was talking with the woman of Samaria by the well in its suburb (John iv. 8). And from Luke ix. 52, we learn that the disciples went before our Lord at his command into a certain village

of the Samaritans "to make ready" for him. Unless, indeed (though, as we see on both occasions, our Lord's influence over them was not yet complete), we are to attribute this partial abandonment of their ordinary scruples to the change which his example had already wrought in them.

¹⁴ Matt. x. 5, 6. ¹⁵ Acts i. 8. ¹⁶ John iv. 22.

Samaritans, or that it had ever been so. "Samaria," says Josephus,¹⁷ "lies between Judæa and Galilee. It commences from a village called Ginæa (*Jenin*), on the great plain, that of Esdraclon, and extends to the toparchy of Acrabatta," in the lower part of the territory of Ephraim. These points, indicating the extreme northern and the extreme southern parallels of latitude between which Samaria was situated, enable us to fix its boundaries with tolerable certainty. It was bounded northward by the range of hills which commences at Mount Carmel on the west, and, after making a bend to the south-west, runs almost due east to the valley of the Jordan, forming the southern border of the plain of Esdraclon. It touched toward the south, as nearly as possible, the northern limits of Benjamin. Thus it comprehended the ancient territory of Ephraim, and of those Manassites who were west of Jordan. "Its character," Josephus continues, "is in no respect different from that of Judæa. Both abound in mountains and plains, and are suited for agriculture, and productive, wooded, and full of fruits both wild and cultivated. They are not abundantly watered; but much rain falls there. The springs are of an exceedingly sweet taste; and, on account of the quantity of good grass, the cattle there produce more milk than elsewhere. But the best proof of their richness and fertility is that both are thickly populated." The accounts of modern travelers confirm this description by the Jewish historian of the "good land" which was allotted to that powerful portion of the house of Joseph which crossed the Jordan, on the first division of the territory. The Cuthæan Samaritans, however, possessed only a few towns and villages of this large area, and these lay almost together in the centre of the district. Shechem or Sychar (as it was contemptuously designated) was their chief settlement, even before Alexander the Great destroyed Samaria, probably because it lay almost close to Mount Gerizim. Afterward it became more prominently so, and there, on the destruction of the temple on Gerizim, by John Hyrcanus,¹⁸ they built themselves a poor temple. The modern representative of Shechem is *Nablûs*, a corruption of Neapolis, or the "New Town" built by Vespasian a little to the west of the older town, which was then ruined. At *Nablûs*, though in very mean plight, the Samaritans have a settlement still, consisting of about 200 persons. Yet they observe the Law, and celebrate the Passover on a sacred spot on Mount Gerizim with an exactness of minute ceremonial which the Jews themselves have long intermitted.¹⁹ Of the *Samaritan Pentateuch* we shall have to speak presently.

✱ § 4. THE JEWS OF THE DISPERSION, or simply THE DISPERSION, was the general title applied to those Jews who remained settled in foreign countries after the return from the Babylonian exile, and during the period of the second Temple. The Dispersion, as a distinct element influencing the entire character of the Jews, dates from the Babylonian exile. Uncertain legends point to earlier settlements in Arabia, Ethiopia, and Abyssinia; but even if these settlements were made, they were isolated and casual, while the Dispersion, of which Babylon was the acknowledged centre, was the outward proof that a *faith* had succeeded to a *kingdom*. Apart from

¹⁷ B. J. iii. 8, § 4.

¹⁸ Joseph. Ant. xiii. 9, § 1.

¹⁹ For accounts of their celebration of the Day of Atonement and the Passover, see

Grove in *Vacation Tourists*, 1861, and Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, Appendix iii.

the necessary influence which Jewish communities, bound by common laws, ennobled by the possession of the same truths, and animated by kindred hopes, must have exercised on the nations among whom they were scattered, the difficulties which set aside the literal observance of the Mosaic ritual led to a wider view of the scope of the law, and a stronger sense of its spiritual significance. Outwardly and inwardly, by its effects both on the Gentiles and on the people of Israel, the Dispersion appears to have been the clearest providential preparation for the spread of Christianity.

But while the fact of a recognized Dispersion must have weakened the local and ceremonial influences which were essential to the first training of the people of God, the Dispersion was still bound together in itself and to its mother country by religious ties. The Temple was the acknowledged centre of Judaism, and the faithful Jew everywhere contributed the half-shekel toward its maintenance.²⁰ Treasuries were established to receive the payments of different districts, and the collected sums were forwarded to Jerusalem, as in later times the Mahometan offerings were sent to Mecca.

§ 5. At the beginning of the Christian era the Dispersion was divided into three great sections, the *Babylonian*, the *Syrian*, the *Egyptian*. Precedence was yielded to the first. The jealousy which had originally existed between the poor who returned to Palestine and their wealthier countrymen at Babylon had passed away, and Gamaliel wrote "to the sons of the Dispersion in Babylonia, and to our brethren in Media . . . and to all the Dispersion of Israel." From Babylon the Jews spread throughout Persia, Media, and Parthia; but the settlements in China belong to a modern date. The few details of their history which have been preserved bear witness to their prosperity and influence. No schools of learning are noticed, but Hillel the Elder and Nahum the Mede are mentioned as coming from Babylon to Jerusalem.

§ 6. The Greek conquests in Asia extended the limits of the Dispersion. Selencus Nicator transplanted large bodies of Jewish colonists from Babylonia to the capitals of his western provinces. His policy was followed by his successor Antiochus the Great; and the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes only served to push forward the Jewish emigration to the remoter districts of his empire. In Armenia the Jews arrived at the greatest dignities, and Nisibis became a new centre of colonization. The Jews of Cappadocia²¹ are casually mentioned in the Mishna; and a prince and princess of Adiabene adopted the Jewish faith only thirty years before the destruction of the Temple. Large settlements of Jews were established in Cyprus, in the islands of the Ægean, and on the western coast of Asia Minor. The Romans confirmed to them the privileges which they had obtained from the Syrian kings; and though they were exposed to sudden outbursts of popular violence, the Jews of the Syrian provinces gradually formed a closer connection with their new homes, and together with the Greek language adopted in many respects Greek ideas, and so became "*Hellenists*."

§ 7. This Hellenizing tendency, however, found its most free development at *Alexandria*. According to Josephus, Alexander himself assigned to the Jews a place in his new city; "and they obtained," he adds, "equal

²⁰ τὸ δίδραχμον, *Math.* xvii. 24.

²¹ 1 Pet. i. 1.

privileges with the Macedonians" ²² in consideration "of their services against the Egyptians." ²³ Ptolemy I. imitated the policy of Alexander, and after the capture of Jerusalem he removed a considerable number of its citizens to Alexandria. The numbers and importance of the Egyptian Jews were rapidly increased under the Ptolemies by fresh immigrations and untiring industry. Philo estimates them in his time at little less than 1,000,000; ²⁴ and adds, that two of the five districts of Alexandria were called "Jewish districts;" and that many Jews lived scattered in the remaining three. For some time the Jewish Church in Alexandria was in close dependence on that of Jerusalem. Both were subject to the civil power of the first Ptolemies, and both acknowledged the high-priest as their religious head. The persecution of Ptolemy IV. Philopator (217 B.C.) occasioned the first political separation between the two bodies. From that time the Jews of Palestine attached themselves to the fortunes of Syria; and the same policy which alienated the Palestinian party gave unity and decision to the Jews of Alexandria. The Septuagint translation, which strengthened the barrier of language between Palestine and Egypt, and the temple of Leontopolis (161 B.C.) which subjected the Egyptian Jews to the charge of schism, widened the breach which was thus opened. But the division, though marked, was not complete. At the beginning of the Christian era the Egyptian Jews still paid the contributions to the temple-service. Jerusalem, though its name was fashioned to a Greek shape, was still the Holy City—the metropolis, not of a country, but of a people—and the Alexandrians had a synagogue there. ²⁵ The internal administration of the Alexandrine Church was independent of the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem; but respect survived submission. There were, however, other causes which tended to produce at Alexandria a distinct form of the Jewish character and faith. The religion and philosophy of that restless city produced an effect upon the people more powerful than the influence of politics or commerce. Alexander himself symbolized the spirit with which he wished to animate his new capital by founding a temple of Isis side by side with the temples of the Grecian gods. The creeds of the East and West were to co-exist in friendly union; and in after times the mixed worship of Serapis was characteristic of the Greek kingdom of Egypt. This catholicity of worship was further combined with the spread of universal learning. The same monarchs who favored the worship of Serapis founded and embellished the Museum and Library; and part of the Library was deposited in the Serapeum. The new faith and the new literature led to a common issue; and the Egyptian Jews necessarily imbibed the spirit which prevailed around them. The Jews were, indeed, peculiarly susceptible of the influences to which they were exposed. They presented from the first a capacity for Eastern or Western development. To the faith and conservatism of the Oriental they united the activity and energy of the Greek. The mere presence of Hellenic culture could not fail to call into play their powers of speculation, which were hardly repressed by the traditional legalism of Palestine; and the unchanging element of divine revelation, which they always retained, enabled them to harmonize new thought with old belief. But while the intercourse of the Jew and Greek would have produced the same general consequences in any case, Alexandria was peculiarly adapt-

²² *G. Ap. II. iv.*²³ *B. J. II. 18, 7.*²⁴ *In Flacc. § 6, p. 971.*²⁵ *Acts vi. 9.*

ed to ensure their full effect. The result of the contact of Judaism with the many creeds which were current there must have been speedy and powerful. The allegoric exposition of the Pentateuch by Aristobulus, which is the earliest Greek fragment of Jewish writing that has been preserved (about 160 B.C.), contains large Orphic quotations which had been already moulded into a Jewish form, and the attempt thus made to connect the most ancient Hellenic traditions with the Law was often repeated afterward. But the indirect influence of Greek literature and philosophy produced still greater effects upon the Alexandrine Jews than the open conflict and combination of religious dogmas. The literary school of Alexandria was essentially critical and not creative. For the first time men labored to collect, revise, and classify all the records of the past. Poets trusted to their learning rather than to their imagination. Language became a study; and the legends of early mythology are transformed into philosophic mysteries. The Jews took a vigorous share in these new studies. The caution against writing, which became a settled law in Palestine, found no favor in Egypt. Numerous authors adapted the history of the Patriarchs, of Moses, and of the Kings, to classical models (Eupolemus, Artapanus (?), Demetrius, Aristæus, Cleodemus or Malchas, "a prophet"). A poem, which bears the name of Phocylides, gives in verse various precepts of Leviticus; and several large fragments of a "tragedy" in which Ezekiel (c. B.C. 110) dramatized the Exodus, have been preserved by Eusebius, who also quotes numerous passages in heroic verse from the elder Philo and Theodotus. The same Aristobulus who gave currency to the Judæo-Orphic verses endeavored to show that the Pentateuch was the real source of Greek philosophy. The proposition thus enunciated was thoroughly congenial to the Alexandrine character; and henceforth it was the chief object of Jewish speculation to trace out the subtle analogies which were supposed to exist between the writings of Moses and the teaching of the schools. The study of the Platonic philosophy at Alexandria gave a further impulse to this attempt. The belief in the existence of a spiritual meaning underlying the letter of Scripture was the great principle on which the Jewish investigations rested. The facts were supposed to be essentially symbolic: the language the veil (or sometimes the mask) which partly disguised from common sight the truths which it enwrapped.

§ 8. The Jewish settlements established at Alexandria by Alexander and Ptolemy I. became the source of the *African Dispersion*, which spread over the north coast of Africa, and perhaps inland to Abyssinia. At Cyrene and Berenice (Tripoli) the Jewish inhabitants formed a considerable portion of the population. The African Dispersion, like all other Jews, preserved their veneration for the "Holy City," and recognized the universal claims of the Temple by the annual tribute. But the distinction in language led to wider differences, which were averted in Babylon by the currency of an Aramaic dialect. The Scriptures were no longer read on the Sabbath. Still the national spirit of the African Jews was not destroyed. After the destruction of the Temple, the Zealots found a reception in Cyrene, and toward the close of the reign of Trajan, A.D. 115, the Jewish population in Africa rose with terrible ferocity. The insurrection was put down by a war of extermination, and the remnant who escaped established themselves on the opposite coast of Europe, as the beginning of a new Dispersion.

§ 9. The Jewish settlements in *Rome* were consequent upon the occupation of Jerusalem by Pompey, B.C. 63. The captives and emigrants whom he brought with him were located in the trans-Tiberine quarter, and by degrees rose in station and importance. They were favored by Augustus and Tiberius after the fall of Sejanus; and a Jewish school was founded at Rome. In the reign of Claudius, the Jews became objects of suspicion from their immense numbers; and the internal disputes, consequent perhaps upon the preaching of Christianity, led to their banishment from the city.²⁶ This expulsion, if general, can only have been temporary, for in a few years the Jews at Rome were numerous,²⁷ and continued to be sufficiently conspicuous to attract the attention of the satirists.²⁸

§ 10. The influence of the Dispersion on the rapid promulgation of Christianity can scarcely be overrated. The course of the apostolic preaching followed in a regular progress the line of the Jewish settlements. The mixed assembly from which the first converts were gathered on the day of Pentecost represented each division of the Dispersion;²⁹ (1) Parthians . . . Mesopotamia; (2) Judæa (i. e. *Syria*) . . . Pamphylia; (3) Egypt . . . Greece; (4) Romans . . . ; and these converts naturally prepared the way for the apostles in the interval which preceded the beginning of the separate apostolic missions. The names of the seven deacons are all Greek, and one is specially described as a proselyte.³⁰ The church at Antioch, by which St. Paul was entrusted with his great work among the heathen,³¹ included Barnabas of Cyprus,³² Lucius of Cyrene, and Simeon surnamed Niger; and among his "follow-laborers" at a later time are found Aquila of Pontus,³³ Apollos of Alexandria,³⁴ and Urbanus,³⁵ and Clement,³⁶ whose names, at least, are Roman. Antioch itself became a centre of the Christian Church,³⁷ as it had been of the Jewish Dispersion; and throughout the apostolic journeys the Jews were the class to whom "it was necessary that the Word of God should be first spoken,"³⁸ and they in turn were united with the mass of the population by the intermediate body of "the devout," which had recognized in various degrees "the faith of the God of Israel."

§ 11. THE PROSELYTES. After the Captivity, the Proselytes were for the most part willing adherents to the Jewish faith. With the conquests of Alexander, the wars between Egypt and Syria, the struggle under the Maccabees, the expansion of the Roman empire, the Jews became more widely known, and their power to proselytize increased. The influence was sometimes obtained well, and exercised for good. In most of the great cities of the empire there were men who had been rescued from idolatry and its attendant debasements, and brought under the power of a higher moral law. The converts who were thus attracted joined, with varying strictness, in the worship of the Jews. They were present in their synagogues;³⁹ they came up as pilgrims to the great feasts at Jerusalem.⁴⁰ In Palestine itself the influence was often stronger and better. Even Roman centurions learned to love the conquered nation, built synagogues

²⁶ Suet. *Claud.* 25: *Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.*
Acts xviii. 2.

²⁷ Acts xxviii. 17 ff.

²⁸ Mart. *Ep.* xi. 94; Juv. *Sat.* iii. 14.

²⁹ Acts ii. 9-11. ³⁰ Acts vi. 5.

³¹ Acts xiii. 1. ³² Acts iv. 36.

³³ Acts xviii. 2.

³⁴ Acts xviii. 24; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6.

³⁵ Rom. xvi. 9. ³⁶ Phil. iv. 3.

³⁷ Acts xiii. 1, xiv. 26, xv. 22, xviii. 22.

³⁸ Acts xiii. 46.

³⁹ Acts xiii. 42, 43, 50, xvii. 4, xviii. 7.

⁴⁰ Acts ii. 10.

for them,⁴¹ fasted and prayed, and gave alms, after the pattern of the strictest Jews,⁴² and became preachers of the new faith to the soldiers under them.⁴³ Such men, drawn by what was best in Judaism, were naturally among the readiest receivers of the new truth which rose out of it, and became, in many cases, the nucleus of a Gentile church.

Proselytism had, however, its darker side. The Jews of Palestine were eager to spread their faith by the same weapons as those with which they had defended it. Had not the power of the Empire stood in the way, the religion of Moses, stripped of its higher elements, might have been propagated far and wide by force, as was afterward the religion of Mahomet. As it was, the Idumæans had the alternative offered them by John Hyrcanus of death, exile, or circumcision.⁴⁴ The Ituræans were converted in the same way by Aristobulus.⁴⁵ Where force was not in their power,⁴⁶ they obtained their ends by the most unscrupulous fraud. They appeared as soothsayers, diviners, exorcists; and addressed themselves especially to the fears and superstitions of women. Their influence over these became the subject of indignant satire.⁴⁷ Those who were most active in proselytizing were precisely those from whose teaching all that was most true and living had departed. The vices of the Jew were engrafted on the vices of the heathen. A repulsive casuistry released the convert from obligations which he had before recognized,⁴⁸ while in other things he was bound, hand and foot, to an unhealthy superstition. It was no wonder that he became "twofold more the child of hell"⁴⁹ than the Pharisees themselves.

The position of such proselytes was indeed every way pitiable. At Rome, and in other large cities, they became the butts of popular scurrility.⁵⁰ Among the Jews themselves their case was not much better. For the most part the convert gained but little honor, even from those who gloried in having brought him over to their sect and party. The popular Jewish feeling about them was like the popular Christian feeling about a converted Jew.

We find in the Talmud a distinction between Proselytes of the Gate and Proselytes of Righteousness.

1. The term *Proselytes of the Gate* was derived from the frequently occurring description in the Law, "the stranger that is within thy gates."⁵¹ Converts of this class were not bound by circumcision and the other special laws of the Mosaic code. It was enough for them to observe the seven precepts of Noah—i. e., the six supposed to have been given to Adam, (1) against idolatry, (2) against blaspheming, (3) against bloodshed, (4) against uncleanness, (5) against theft, (6) of obedience, with (7) the prohibition of "flesh with the blood thereof" given to Noah. The proselyte was not to claim the privileges of an Israelite, might not redeem his first-born, or pay the half-shekel. He was forbidden to study the Law under pain of death. The later Rabbis insisted that the profession of his faith should be made solemnly in the presence of three witnesses. The Jubilee was the

⁴¹ Luke vii. 5. ⁴² Act. x. 2, 30. ⁴³ Acts x. 7.

⁴⁴ Joseph. *Ant.* xiii. 9, § 8.

⁴⁵ Joseph. *Ant.* xiii. 11, § 3.

⁴⁶ The "veluti Judæi, cogemus" of Hor. *Sat.* i. 4. 142, implies that they sometimes ventured on it even at Rome.

⁴⁷ Juv. *Sat.* vi. 543-547.

⁴⁸ The Law of the Corban may serve as one instance (Matt. xv. 4-6).

⁴⁹ Matt. xxiii. 15.

⁵⁰ The words "curtus," "verpes," met them at every corner (Hor. *Sat.* i. 4, 142; Mart. vii. 29, 34, 81, xi. 25, xii. 37).

⁵¹ Ex. xx. 10, etc.

proper season for his admission. All this seems so full and precise that it has led many writers to look on it as representing a reality; and most commentators accordingly have seen these Proselytes of the Gate in the "Religious proselytes," "the devout persons," "devout men," of the Acts.⁵² It remains doubtful, however, whether it was ever more than a paper scheme of what ought to be, disguising itself as having actually been. All that can be said is, that in the time of the N. T. we have independent evidence⁵³ of the existence of converts of two degrees, and that the Talmudic division is the formal systematizing of an earlier fact.

2. *The Proselytes of Righteousness*, known also as Proselytes of the Covenant, were perfect Israelites. We learn from the Talmud that, in addition to circumcision, baptism was also required to complete their admission to the faith. The proselyte was placed in a tank or pool, up to his neck in water. His teachers, who now acted as his sponsors, repeated the great commandments of the Law. These he promised and vowed to keep, and then, with an accompanying benediction, he plunged under the water. To leave one hand-breadth of his body unsubmerged would have vitiated the whole rite.⁵⁴ The Rabbis carried back the origin of the baptism to a remote antiquity, finding it in the command of Jacob⁵⁵ and of Moses.⁵⁶ The Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan inserts the word "Thou shalt circumcise and baptize" in Ex. xii. 44. Even in the Ethiopic version of Matt. xxiii. 15, we find "compass sea and land to baptize one proselyte." The baptism was followed, as long as the Temple stood, by the offering or Corban.

It is obvious that this account suggests many questions of grave interest. Was this ritual observed as early as the commencement of the first century? If so, was the baptism of John, or that of the Christian Church, in any way derived from, or connected with, the baptism of proselytes? If not, was the latter in any way borrowed from the former?

It will be enough to sum up the conclusions which seem fairly to be drawn from the controversy on this subject. (1.) There is no direct evidence of the practice being in use before the destruction of Jerusalem. (2.) The negative argument drawn from the silence of the O. T., of the Apocrypha, of Philo, and of Josephus, is almost decisive against the belief that there was, in their time, a baptism of proselytes with *as much* importance attached to it as we find in the Talmudists. (3.) It is probable, however, that there was a baptism in use at a period considerably earlier than that for which we have direct evidence. (4.) The history of the N. T. itself suggests the existence of such a custom. A sign is seldom chosen unless it already has a meaning for those to whom it is addressed. The fitness of the sign in this case would be in proportion to the associations already connected with it. The question of the Priests and Levites, "Why baptizest thou then?"⁵⁷ implies that they wondered, not at the thing itself, but at its being done for Israelites by one who disclaimed the names which, in their eyes, would have justified the introduction of a new order.

⁵² Οἱ σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι (Acts xlii. 45); οἱ σεβόμενοι (Acts xvii. 4, 17); ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς (Acts ii. 5).

⁵³ See the decree of the so-called Council of Jerusalem in Acts xv.

⁵⁴ Ugolini xxii.

⁵⁵ Gen. xxxv. 2.

⁵⁶ Ex. xix. 10.

⁵⁷ John i. 25.

SECTION II.

THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES.

§ 1. The HEBREW CANON: commentaries upon it. The *Mishna*. § 2. *Targums*. § 3. The Greek SEPTUAGINT. § 4. The SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH. § 5. The APOCRYPHA—Meaning and origin of the word; character of the collection. § 6. *Books of Esdras*. § 7. *Tobit*. § 8. *Judith*. § 9. *Ester*. § 10. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. § 11. *Ecclesiasticus*. § 12. *Baruch*. § 13. *The Song of the Three Children—Susannah—Bel and the Dragon*. § 14. *The Prayer of Manasses*. § 15. *Books of the Maccabees*.

§ 1. OF the HEBREW CANON an account has been already given in the Appendix to the *Old Testament History*;¹ but on the return of the Jews from captivity arose two important branches of Jewish literature—the *Mishna* and the *Targums*—each of which requires a few words of explanation.

The *Mishna*, or the “second law,” which forms the first portion of the Talmud, is a digest of the Jewish traditions, and a compendium of the whole ritual law, reduced to writing in its present form by Rabbi Jehudah the Holy, a Jew of great wealth and influence, who flourished in the 2d century before Christ, and represents the traditions which were current among the Jews at the time of Christ. It is very concisely written, and requires notes. This circumstance led to the Commentaries called *Gemara*² (i. e., Supplement, Completion), which form the second part of the Talmud, and which are very commonly meant when the word “Talmud” is used by itself. The language of the *Mishna* is that of the later Hebrew, purely written on the whole, though with a few grammatical Aramaisms, and interspersed with Greek, Latin and Aramaic words which had become naturalized. The *Mishna* contains the *oral tradition*, which at length came to be esteemed far above the sacred text. It was the fundamental principle of the Pharisees that by the side of the written law there was an oral law to complete and to explain the written law. It was an article of faith that in the Pentateuch there was no precept, and no regulation, ceremonial, doctrinal, or legal, of which God had not given to Moses all explanations necessary for their application, with the order to transmit by word of mouth. The classical passage in the *Mishna* on this subject is the following:—“Moses received the (oral) law from Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue.”

§ 2. The Jews, on the return from captivity, no longer spoke the Hebrew language; and as the common people had lost all knowledge of the tongue in which the sacred books were written, it naturally followed that recourse must be had to a translation into the idiom with which they were familiar—the Chaldee or Aramaic. Moreover, since a bare translation could not

¹ See p. 555, seq.

² There are two *Gemaras*; one of Jerusalem, in which there is said to be no passage which can be proved to be later than the first half of the 4th century; and the other of Babylon, completed about 500 A.D. The latter is the most important, and by far the longest.

in all cases suffice, it was necessary to add to the translation an explanation, more particularly of the more difficult and obscure passages. Both translation and explanation were designated by the term *Targum*. The Targums were originally oral, and the earliest Targum, which is that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, began to be committed to memory about the 2d century of the Christian era; though it did not assume its present shape till the end of the 3d, or the beginning of the 4th century. It is written in the Chaldee dialect, closely approaching in purity of idiom to that of Ezra and Daniel. It follows a sober and clear, though not a slavish exegesis, and keeps as closely and minutely to the text as is at all consistent with its purpose, viz., to be chiefly, and above all, *a version for the people*. Its explanations of difficult and obscure passages bear ample witness to the competence of those who gave it its final shape. It avoids the legendary character with which all the later Targums entwine the Biblical word, as far as ever circumstances would allow.³

§ 3. The SEPTUAGINT or Greek version of the Old Testament, owed its origin to the same cause as the Targums. The Jews of Alexandria had probably still less knowledge of Hebrew than their brethren in Palestine; their familiar language was Alexandrian Greek. They had settled in Alexandria in large numbers soon after the time of Alexander, and under the early Ptolemies. They would naturally follow the same practice as the Jews in Palestine; and hence would arise in time an entire Greek version. But the numbers and names of the translators, and the times at which different portions were translated, are all uncertain. The common received story respecting its origin is contained in an extant letter ascribed to Aristeas, who was an officer at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus. This letter, which is addressed by Aristeas to his brother, Philocrates, gives a splendid account of the origin of the Septuagint; of the embassy and presents sent by King Ptolemy to the high-priest at Jerusalem, by the advice of Demetrius Phalereus, his librarian, 50 talents of gold and 70 talents of silver, etc.; the Jewish slaves whom he set free, paying their ransom himself; the letter of the king; the answer of the high-priest; the choosing of six interpreters from each of the twelve tribes, and their names; the copy of the Law, in letters of gold; the feast prepared for the seventy-two, which continued for seven days; the questions proposed to each of the interpreters in turn, with the answers of each; their lodging by the sea-shore; and the accomplishment of their work in seventy-two days, by conference and comparison. This is the story, which probably gave to the Version the title of the Septuagint, and which has been repeated in various forms by the Christian writers. But it is now generally admitted that the letter is spurious, and is probably the fabrication of an Alexandrian Jew shortly before the Christian era. Still there can be no doubt that there was a basis of fact for the fiction: on three points of the story there is no material difference of opinion, and they are confirmed by the study of the Version itself:—1. The Version was made at Alexandria. 2. It was begun in the time of the earlier Ptolemies, about 280 B.C. 3. The Law (i. e., the Pentateuch) alone was translated at first.

The Septuagint version was lightly esteemed by the Hellenistic Jews before the coming of Christ. The manner in which it is quoted by the

³ Respecting the later Targums, see *Dict. of Bible*, art. VERSIONS.

writers of the New Testament proves that it had been long in general use. Wherever, by the conquests of Alexander, or by colonization, the Greek language prevailed; wherever Jews were settled, and the attention of the neighboring Gentiles was drawn to their wondrous history and law, there was found the Septuagint, which thus became, by Divine Providence, the means of spreading widely the knowledge of the One True God, and his promises of a Saviour to come, throughout the nations. To the wide dispersion of this version we may ascribe in great measure that general persuasion of the near approach of the Redeemer which prevailed over the whole East, and led the Magi to recognize the star which proclaimed the birth of the King of the Jews.

Not less wide was the influence of the Septuagint in the spread of the Gospel. Many of those Jews who were assembled at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, from Asia Minor, from Africa, from Crete and Rome, used the Greek language; the testimonies to Christ from the Law and the Prophets came to them in the words of the Septuagint; St. Stephen probably quoted from it in his address to the Jews; the Ethiopian eunuch was reading the Septuagint version of Isaiah in his chariot; they who were scattered abroad went forth into many lands, speaking of Christ in Greek, and pointing to the things written of him in the Greek version of Moses and the Prophets; from Antioch and Alexandria in the East, to Rome and Massilia in the West, the voice of the Gospel sounded forth in Greek; Clemens of Rome, Ignatius at Antioch, Justin Martyr in Palestine, Irenæus at Lyons, and many more, taught and wrote in the words of the Greek Scriptures; and a still wider range was given to them by the Latin version (or versions) made from the LXX. for the use of the Latin Churches in Italy and Africa; and in later times by the numerous other versions into the tongues of Egypt, Ethiopia, Armenia, Arabia, and Georgia. For a long period the Septuagint was the Old Testament of the far larger part of the Christian Church.

§ 4. The SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH is a Recension of the commonly received Hebrew Text of the Mosaic Law, in use with the Samaritans, and written in the ancient Hebrew, or so-called Samaritan character. It differs in several important points from the Hebrew text. Among these may be mentioned: 1. Emendations of passages and words of the Hebrew text which contain something objectionable in the eyes of the Samaritans, on account either of historical improbability or apparent want of dignity in the terms applied to the Creator. Thus in the Samaritan Pentateuch no one in the antediluvian times begets his first son after he has lived 150 years: but one hundred years are, where necessary, subtracted before, and added after, the birth of the first son. 2. Alterations made in favor or on behalf of Samaritan theology, hermeneutics, and domestic worship. Thus the word *Elohim*, four times construed with the plural verb in the Hebrew Pentateuch, is in the Samaritan Pent. joined to the singular verb (Gen. xx. 13, xxxi. 53, xxxv. 7; Ex. xxii. 9); and further, anthropomorphisms as well as anthropopathisms are carefully expunged—a practice very common in later times. The last and perhaps most momentous of all intentional alterations is the constant change of all the phrases, “God will choose a spot,” into “He has chosen,” viz., Gerizim, and the well-known substitution of Gerizim for Ebal in Deut. xxvii. 4. In Exodus as well as in Deuteronomy the Sam. has, immediately after the Ten Commandments, the following insertions from

Deut. xxvii. 2-7 and xi. 30: "And it shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan . . . ye shall set up these stones . . . on Mount Gerizim . . . and there shalt thou build an altar . . . 'That mountain' on the other side Jordan by the way where the sun goeth down . . . in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh, 'over against Shechem.'"

The origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch has given rise to much controversy, into which we can not enter in this place. The two most usual opinions are: 1. That it came into the hands of the Samaritans as an inheritance from the ten tribes whom they succeeded. 2. That it was introduced by Manasseh, at the time of the foundation of the Samaritan Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim.⁴

§ 5. THE APOCRYPHA.⁵ The collection of Books to which this term is popularly applied includes the following. The order given is that in which they stand in the English version. I. 1 Esdras. II. 2 Esdras. III. Tobit. IV. Judith. V. The rest of the chapters of the Book of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew nor in the Chaldee. VI. The Wisdom of Solomon. VII. The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus. VIII. Baruch. IX. The Song of the Three Holy Children. X. The History of Susanna. XI. The History of the destruction of Bel and the Dragon. XII. The Prayer of Manasseh, king of Judah. XIII. 1 Maccabees. XIV. 2 Maccabees.

The primary meaning of *Apocrypha*, "hidden, secret," seems, toward the close of the 2d century, to have been associated with the signification "spurious," and ultimately to have settled down into the latter. The conjectural explanation given in the translation of the English Bible,⁶ "because they were wont to be read not openly and in common, but as it were in secret and apart," is, as regards some of the books now bearing the name, at variance with fact. The testimonies of the Fathers harmonize with the belief that the use of the word as applied to special books originated in the claim, common to nearly all the sects that participated in the Gnostic character, to a secret esoteric knowledge, deposited in books which were made known only to the initiated. It seems not unlikely that there is a reference in Col. ii. 18 to the pretensions of such teachers. The books of our own Apocrypha bear witness both to the feeling and the way in which it worked. The inspiration of the Pseudo-Esdras (2 Esdr. xiv. 40-47) leads him to dictate 204 books, of which the last 70 are to be "delivered only to such as are wise among the people." It was almost a matter of course that these secret books should be pseudonymous, ascribed to the great names in Jewish or heathen history that had become associated with the reputation of a mysterious wisdom. So books in the existing Apocrypha bear the names of Solomon, Daniel, Jeremiah, Ezra. These books represent the period of transition and decay which followed on the return from Babylon, when the prophets who were then the teachers of the people had passed away and the age of scribes succeeded. Uncertain as may be the dates of individual books, few, if any, can be thrown further back than the commencement of the 8d century B.C. The latest, the 2d Book of Esdras, is probably not later than 30 B.C., 2 Esdr. vii. 28 being a subsequent interpolation. The alterations of the

⁴ For an account of the controversy respecting the origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, see *Dict. of Bible*, art. SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

⁵ Βιβλία Ἀπόκρυφα.

⁶ Ed. 1583, Preface to Apocrypha.

Jewish character, the different phases which Judaism presented in Palestine and Alexandria, the good and the evil which were called forth by contact with idolatry in Egypt, and by the struggle against it in Syria, all these present themselves to the reader of the Apocrypha with greater or less distinctness.

The following is a brief account of the separate books :

§ 6. *The First and Second Books of Esdras* are called in the Vulgate, and in all the earlier editions of the English Bible, the *third* and *fourth* books. In the Vulgate 1st Esdras means the canonical book of Ezra, and 2d Esdras means Nehemiah.

(i.) *First Book of Esdras*.—The first chapter is a transcript of the two last chapters of 2 Chr., for the most part *verbatim*. Chapters iii., iv., and v., to the end of v. 6, are the *original* portions of the book, and the rest is a transcript more or less exact of the book of Ezra, with the chapters transposed and quite otherwise arranged, and a portion of Nehemiah. Hence a twofold design in the compiler is discernible: one to introduce and give Scriptural sanction to the legend about Zerubbabel; the other to explain the great obscurities of the book of Ezra, in which however he has signally failed. The *original* portion of the book seems to indicate that the writer was thoroughly conversant with Hebrew, even if he did not write the book in that language.

(ii.) *The Second Book of Esdras* was originally called “the Apocalypse of Ezra,” which is a far more appropriate title. The Greek text, in which it was originally written, is lost. The common Latin text, which is followed in the English version, contains two important interpolations (Ch. i. ii.; xv. xvi.) which are not found in the Arabic and Æthiopic versions, and are separated from the genuine Apocalypse in the best Latin MSS. Both of these passages are evidently of Christian origin. The original Apocalypse (iii.–xiv.) consists of a series of angelic revelations and visions, in which Ezra is instructed in some of the great mysteries of the moral world, and assured of the final triumph of the righteous.

§ 7. *Tobit*.—The scene of this book is placed in Assyria, whither Tobit, a Jew, had been carried as a captive by Shalmaneser. But it must have been written considerably later than the Babylonian captivity, and can not be regarded as a true history. It is a didactic narrative; and its point lies in the moral lessons which it conveys, and not in the narrative. In modern times the moral excellence of the book has been rated highly, except in the heat of controversy. Luther pronounced it, if only a fiction, yet “a truly beautiful, wholesome, and profitable fiction, the work of a gifted poet. . . . A book useful for Christian reading.” Nowhere else is there preserved so complete and beautiful a picture of the domestic life of the Jews after the Return.

§ 8. *Judith*.—This book, like that of Tobit, belongs to the earliest specimens of historical fiction. The narrative of the reign of “Nebuchadnezzar king of Nineveh” (i. 1), of the campaign of Holofernes, and the deliverance of Bethulia, through the stratagem and courage of the Jewish heroine, contains too many and too serious difficulties, both historical and geographical, to allow of the supposition that it is either literally true, or even carefully moulded on truth. But the value of the book is not lessened by its fictitious character. On the contrary it becomes even more valuable as exhibiting an ideal type of heroism, which was outwardly embodied in the wars of in-

dependence. The self-sacrificing faith and unscrupulous bravery of Judith were the qualities by which the champions of Jewish freedom were then enabled to overcome the power of Syria, which seemed at the time scarcely less formidable than the imaginary hosts of Holofernes. The peculiar character of the book, which is exhibited in these traits, affords the best indication of its date; for it can not be wrong to refer its origin to the Maccabæan period, which it reflects not only in its general spirit but even in smaller traits.

§ 9. *Esther*.—The additions to the book of Esther have been spoken of in the “Old Testament History.”⁷

§ 10. *The Wisdom of Solomon*.—This book may be divided into two parts, the first (cc. i.-ix.) containing the doctrine of Wisdom in its moral and intellectual aspects; the second, the doctrine of Wisdom as shown in history (cc. x.-xix.). The first part contains the praise of Wisdom as the source of immortality, in contrast with the teaching of sensualists; and next the praise of Wisdom as the guide of practical and intellectual life, the stay of princes, and the interpreter of the universe. The second part, again, follows the action of Wisdom summarily, as preserving God's servants, from Adam to Moses, and more particularly in the punishment of the Egyptians and Canaanites (xi. 5-16; xi. 17-xii.). From internal evidence it seems most reasonable to believe that the book was composed at Alexandria some time before the time of Philo (about 120-80 B.C.).

§ 11. *The Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus*.—The former is the title of this book in the Septuagint, the latter in the Vulgate, the name “Ecclesiasticus” indicating that the book was publicly used in the service of the Church. Of its author, Jesus (i. e., Jeshna or Joshua), the son of Sirach, “of Jerusalem,” we know absolutely nothing; but his Palestinian origin is substantiated by internal evidence. The language in which the book was originally composed was Hebrew, that is, probably, the vernacular Aramæan dialect. It was translated into Greek by the grandson of the author, in Egypt “in the reign of Euergetes,” for the instruction of those “in a strange country (ἐν παροικίᾳ) who were previously prepared to live after the law.” It is an important monument of the religious state of the Jews at the period of its composition. As an expression of Palestinian theology it stands alone; for there is no sufficient reason for assuming Alexandrine interpolations or direct Alexandrine influence. The conception of God as Creator, Preserver, and Governor, is strictly conformable to the old Mosaic type; but at the same time his mercy is extended to all mankind. Little stress is laid upon the spirit-world, either good or evil; and the doctrine of a resurrection fades away. In addition to the general hope of restoration, one trait only of a Messianic faith is preserved, in which the writer contemplates the future work of Elias. The ethical precepts are addressed to the middle class. The praise of agriculture and medicine, and the constant exhortations to cheerfulness, seem to speak of a time when men's thoughts were turned inward with feelings of despondency and perhaps of fatalism. At least the book marks the growth of that anxious legalism which was conspicuous in the sayings of the later doctors. Life is already imprisoned in rules: religion is degenerating into ritualism: knowledge has taken refuge in schools.

§ 12. *Baruch*.—This book is remarkable as the only one in the Apocry-

⁷ See p. 571.

pha which is formed on the model of the Prophets ; and though it is wanting in originality, it presents a vivid reflection of the ancient prophetic fire. The assumed author is undoubtedly the companion of Jeremiah, but the details of the book are inconsistent with the assumption. It exhibits not only historical inaccuracies, but also evident traces of a later date than the beginning of the captivity. The date of its composition is probably about the time of the war of liberation (B.C. 160), or somewhat earlier.

§ 13. *The Song of the Three Children, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon*, are additions to the canonical book of Daniel, and are spoken of in the "Old Testament History."⁸

§ 14. *The Prayer of Manasses, king of Judah*.—The repentance and restoration of Manasseh⁹ furnished the subject of many legendary stories. "His prayer unto his God" was still preserved "in the book of the kings of Israel" when the Chronicles were compiled,¹⁰ and, after this record was lost, the subject was likely to attract the notice of later writers. "The Prayer" in the Apocrypha is the work of one who has endeavored to express, not without true feeling, the thoughts of the repentant king. The writer was well acquainted with the LXX. ; but beyond this there is nothing to determine the date at which he lived. The clear teaching on repentance points to a time certainly not long before the Christian era. There is no indication of the place at which the Prayer was written.

§ 15. *The First and Second Books of Maccabees*.—(i.) *The First Book of Maccabees* contains a history of the patriotic struggle, from the first resistance of Mattathias, to the settled sovereignty and death of Simon, a period of thirty-three years (B.C. 168-135). The opening chapter gives a short summary of the conquests of Alexander the Great, and describes at greater length the oppression of Antiochus Epiphanes. The great subject of the book begins with the enumeration of the Maccabæan family (ii. 1-5), which is followed by an account of the part which the aged Mattathias took in rousing and guiding the spirit of his countrymen (ii. 6-70). The remainder of the narrative is occupied with the exploits of his five sons. Each of the three divisions, into which the main portion of the book thus naturally falls, is stamped with an individual character derived from its special hero. The great marks of trustworthiness are everywhere conspicuous. Victory and failure and despondency are, on the whole, chronicled with the same candor. There is no attempt to bring into open display the working of Providence. The testimony of antiquity leaves no doubt but that the book was first written in Hebrew. Its whole structure points to Palestine as the place of its composition. There is, however, considerable doubt as to its date. Perhaps we may place it between B.C. 120-100. The date and person of the Greek translator are wholly undetermined.

(ii.) *The Second Book of Maccabees*.—The history of the Second Book of the Maccabees begins some years earlier than that of the First Book, and closes with the victory of Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor. It thus embraces a period of twenty years, from B.C. 180 (?) to B.C. 161. For the few events noticed during the earlier years it is our chief authority ; during the remainder of the time the narrative goes over the same ground as 1 Macc., but with very considerable differences. The first two chapters are taken up by two letters supposed to be addressed by the Palestinian to the Alexan-

⁸ See p. 572.

⁹ 2 Chr. xxxiii. 12 ff.

¹⁰ 2 Chr. xxxiii. 18.

drine Jews, and by a sketch of the author's plan, which proceeds without any perceptible break from the close of the second letter. The main narrative occupies the remainder of the book. This presents several natural divisions, which appear to coincide with the "five books" of Jason on which it was based. The first (c. iii.) contains the history of Heliodorus (cir. B.C. 180). The second (iv.-vii.) gives varied details of the beginning and course of the great persecution (B.C. 175-167). The third (viii.-x. 9) follows the fortunes of Judas to the triumphant restoration of the Temple service (B.C. 166, 165). The fourth (x. 10-xiii.) includes the reign of Antiochus Eupator (B.C. 164-162). The fifth (xiv., xv.) records the treachery of Alcimus, the mission of Nicanor, and the crowning success of Judas (B.C. 162, 161). The writer himself distinctly indicates the source of his narrative—"the five books of Jason of Cyrene" (ii. 28), of which he designed to furnish a short and agreeable epitome for the benefit of those who would be deterred from studying the larger work. His own labor, which he describes in strong terms (ii. 26, 27; comp. xv. 38, 39), was entirely confined to condensation and selection; all investigation of detail he declares to be the peculiar duty of the original historian. Of Jason himself nothing more is known than may be gleaned from this mention of him. The district of Cyrene was most closely united with that of Alexandria. In both the predominance of Greek literature and the Greek language was absolute. The work of Jason must therefore have been composed in Greek; and the style of the epitome proves beyond doubt that the Greek text is the original. It is scarcely less certain that the book was compiled at Alexandria.

The Second Book of Maccabees is not nearly so trustworthy as the First. In the Second Book the groundwork of facts is true, but the dress in which the facts are presented is due in part at least to the narrator. It is not at all improbable that the error with regard to the first campaign of Lysias arose from the mode in which it was introduced by Jason as a prelude to the more important measures of Lysias in the reign of Antiochus Eupator. In other places (as very obviously in xiii. 19 ff.) the compiler may have disregarded the historical dependence of events, while selecting those which were best suited for the support of his theme. The latter half of the book (cc. viii.-xv.) is to be regarded, not as a connected and complete history, but as a series of special incidents from the life of Judas, illustrating the providential interference of God in behalf of His people, true in substance, but embellished in form.

There are two other books of the Maccabees, entitled the *Third* and the *Fourth*, not included in the English Apocrypha. *The Third Book of the Maccabees* contains the history of events which preceded the great Maccabæan struggle. *The Fourth Book of Maccabees* contains a rhetorical narrative of the martyrdom of Eleazar and of the "Maccabæan family," following in the main the same outline as 2 Macc.

SECTION III.

NEW FORMS OF WORSHIP—THE SYNAGOGUES.

§ 1. Importance of the subject. § 2. History of the Synagogues. § 3. Their influence. § 4. Structure. § 5. Internal arrangement. § 6. Officers. § 7. Worship. § 8. Judicial functions.

§ 1. THE word *synagogue*,¹ which means a “congregation,” is used in the New Testament to signify a recognized place of worship. A knowledge of the history and worship of the synagogues is of importance to the student, since they are the great characteristic institution of the later phase of Judaism. More even than the Temple and its services, in the time of which the New Testament treats, they at once represented and determined the religious life of the people. We can not separate them from the most intimate connection with our Lord’s life and ministry. In them he worshipped in his youth, and in his manhood. Whatever we can learn of the ritual which then prevailed tells us of a worship which he recognized and sanctioned; which for that reason, if for no other, though, like the state-liturgical services of the Temple, it was destined to pass away, is worthy of our respect and honor. They were the scenes, too, of no small portion of his work. In them were wrought some of his mightiest works of healing.² In them were spoken some of the most glorious of his recorded words;³ many more, beyond all reckoning, which are not recorded.⁴

§ 2. We know too little of the life of Israel, both before and under the monarchy, to be able to say with certainty whether there was any thing at all corresponding to the synagogues of later date. They appear to have arisen during the exile, in the abeyance of the Temple worship, and to have received their full development on the return of the Jews from captivity. The whole history of Ezra presupposes the habit of solemn, probably of periodic meetings.⁵ The “ancient days” of which St. James speaks⁶ may, at least, go back so far. After the Maccabæan struggle for independence, we find almost every town or village had its one or more synagogues. Where the Jews were not in sufficient numbers to be able to erect and fill a building, there was the *Proseucha*,⁷ or place of prayer, sometimes opened, sometimes covered in, commonly by a running stream or on the sea-shore, in which devout Jews and proselytes met to worship, and, perhaps, to read.⁸

§ 3. It is hardly possible to overestimate the influence of the system thus developed. To it we may ascribe the tenacity with which, after the Maccabæan struggle, the Jews adhered to the religion of their fathers, and never

¹ συναγωγή.

² Mark i. 23; Matt. xii. 9; Luke xiii. 11.

³ Luke iv. 16; John vi. 59.

⁴ Matt. iv. 23, xiii. 54; John xviii. 20, etc.

⁵ Ezr. viii. 15; Neh. viii. 2, ix. 1; Zech. vii. 5.

⁶ Acts xv. 21.

⁷ προσευχή.

⁸ Acts xvi. 13; Juven. Sat. iii. 296.

again relapsed into idolatry. The people were now in no danger of forgetting the Law, and the external ordinances that hedged it round. If pilgrimages were still made to Jerusalem at the great feasts, the habitual religion of the Jews in, and yet more out of Palestine, was connected much more intimately with the synagogue than with the Temple. Its simple edifying devotion, into which mind and heart could alike enter, attracted the heathen proselytes who might have been repelled by the sacrifices of the Temple, or would certainly have been driven from it unless they could make up their minds to submit to circumcision.⁹ Here too there was an influence tending to diminish, and ultimately almost to destroy, the authority of the hereditary priesthood. The services of the synagogue required no sons of Aaron; gave them nothing more than a complimentary precedence. The way was silently prepared for a new and higher order, which should rise in "the fullness of time" out of the decay and abolition of both the priesthood and the Temple. In another way, too, the synagogues everywhere prepared the way for that order. Not "Moses" only, but "the Prophets" were read in them every Sabbath day, and thus the Messianic hopes of Israel, the expectation of a kingdom of Heaven, were universally diffused.

§ 4. The size of a synagogue, like that of a church or chapel, varied with the population. We have no reason for believing that there were any fixed laws of proportion for its dimensions, like those which are traced in the Tabernacle and the Temple. Its position was, however, determinate. It stood, if possible, on the highest ground, in or near the city to which it belonged. Failing this, a tall pole rose from the roof to render it conspicuous. And its direction too was fixed. Jerusalem was the *Kibleh* of Jewish devotion; and the synagogue was so constructed, that the worshipers as they entered, and as they prayed, looked toward it. The building was commonly erected at the cost of the district, whether by a church-rate levied for the purpose, or by free gifts, must remain uncertain. Sometimes it was built by a rich Jew, or even, as in Luke vii. 5, by a friendly proselyte. In the later stages of Eastern Judaism, it was often erected, like the mosques of Mahometans, near the tombs of famous Rabbis or holy men. When the building was finished, it was set apart, as the Temple had been, by a special prayer of dedication. From that time it had a consecrated character. The common acts of life, eating, drinking, reckoning up accounts, were forbidden in it. No one was to pass through it as a short cut. Even if it ceased to be used, the building was not to be applied to any base purpose—might not be turned, *e. g.* into a bath, a laundry, or a tannery.

§ 5. In the internal arrangement of the synagogue we trace an obvious analogy to the type of the Tabernacle. At the upper or Jerusalem end stood the Ark, the chest which, like the older and more sacred Ark, contained the Book of the Law. This part of the synagogue was naturally the place of honor. Here were the "chief seats," after which Pharisees and Scribes strove so eagerly,¹⁰ to which the wealthy and honored worshiper was invited.¹¹ Here, too, in front of the Ark, still reproducing the type of the Tabernacle, was the eight-branched lamp, lighted only on the greater festivals. Besides this, there was one lamp kept burning perpetually. Others, brought by devout worshipers, were lighted at the beginning of the

⁹ Acts xxi. 28.

¹⁰ Matt. xxiii. 6.

¹¹ James ii. 2, 3.

Sabbath, i. e., on Friday evening. A little farther toward the middle of the building was a raised platform, on which several persons could stand at once, and in the middle of this rose a pulpit, in which the Reader stood to read the lesson or sat down to teach. The congregation were divided, men on one side, women on the other, a low partition, five or six feet high, running between them. The arrangements of modern synagogues, for many centuries, have made the separation more complete by placing the women in low side-galleries, screened off by lattice-work. Within the Ark, as above stated, were the rolls of the sacred books. The rollers round which they were wound were often elaborately decorated, the cases for them embroidered or enameled, according to their material. Such cases were customary offerings from the rich when they brought their infant children, on the first anniversary of their birthday, to be blessed by the Rabbi of the synagogue.¹² As part of the fittings we have also to note (1.) another chest for the *Haphtaroth*, or rolls of the prophets. (2.) Alms-boxes at or near the door, after the pattern of those at the Temple, one for the poor of Jerusalem, the other for local charities.¹³ (3.) Notice-boards, on which were written the names of offenders who had been "put out of the synagogue." (4.) A chest for trumpets and other musical instruments, used at the New Years, Sabbaths, and other festivals.

§ 6. In smaller towns there was often but one Rabbi. Where a fuller organization was possible, there was a college of Elders,¹⁴ presided over by one who was *the ruler of the synagogue*.¹⁵ To these elders belonged a variety of synonyms, each with a special significance. They were *shepherds*¹⁶ watching over their flock, *presidents*, as ruling over it.¹⁷ With their head, they formed a kind of Chapter, managed the affairs of the synagogue, and possessed the power of excommunicating.

The most prominent functionary in a large synagogue was known as the *Shēliach* (= *legatus*), the officiating minister who acted as the *delegate* of the congregation, and was therefore the chief reader of prayers, etc., in their name. The conditions laid down for this office remind us of St. Paul's rule for the choice of a bishop. He was to be active, of full age, the father of a family, not rich or engaged in business, possessing a good voice, apt to teach.¹⁸ In him we find, as the name might lead us to expect, the prototype of the "angel of the Church" of Rev. i. 20, ii. 1, etc.

The *Chazzân*, or *servant* of the synagogue,¹⁹ had duties of a lower kind resembling those of the Christian deacon, or sub-deacon. He was to open the door, to get the building ready for service. For him, too, there were conditions like those for the *legatus*. Like the *legatus* and the *elders*, he was appointed by the imposition of hands. Practically he often acted during the week as school-master of the town or village, and in this way came to gain a prominence which placed him nearly on the same level as the *legatus*.

¹² The custom, it may be noticed, connects itself with the memorable history of those who "brought young children" to Jesus that he should touch them (Mark x. 13).

¹³ If this practice existed, as is probable, in the first century, it throws light upon the special stress laid by St. Paul on the collection for the "poor saints" in Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. etc.). The Christian Churches were not to be behind the Jewish Syna-

gogues in their contributions to the Palestine Relief Fund.

¹⁴ πρεσβύτεροι, Luke vii. 3.

¹⁵ Luke viii. 41, 49, xiii. 14; Acts xviii. 8, 17.

¹⁶ Eph. iv. 11.

¹⁷ 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. xii. 7.

¹⁸ Comp. 1 Tim. iii. 1-7; Tit. i. 6-9.

¹⁹ Luke iv. 20.

Besides these, there were ten men attached to every synagogue, whose functions have been the subject-matter of voluminous controversy. They were known as the *Batlanim* (= *Otiosi*), and no synagogue was complete without them. They were to be men of leisure, not obliged to labor for their livelihood, able, therefore, to attend the week-day as well as the Sabbath services. They were, probably, simply a body of men permanently on duty, making up a congregation (ten being the minimum number), so that there might be no delay in beginning the service at the proper hours, and that no single worshiper might go away disappointed.

It will be seen at once how closely the organization of the synagogue was reproduced in that of the Christian *Ecclesia*. Here, also, there was the single presbyter-bishop in small towns, a council of presbyters under one head in large cities. The *legatus* of the synagogue appears in the *ἄγγελος*,²⁰ perhaps also in the *ἀπόστολος*, of the Christian Church. To the elders as such is given the name of Shepherds.²¹ They are known also as *ἡγούμενοι*.²² Even the transfer to the Christian proselytes of the once distinctively sacerdotal name of *ιερεύς*, foreign as it was to the feelings of the Christians of the Apostolic Age, was not without its parallel in the history of the synagogue. Sceva, the exorcist Jew of Ephesus, was probably a "chief priest" in this sense.²³

§ 7. The ritual of the synagogue was to a large extent the reproduction (here also, as with the fabric, with many inevitable changes) of the statelier liturgy of the Temple. It will be enough, in this place, to notice in what way the ritual, no less than the organization, was connected with the facts of the New Testament history, and with the life and order of the Christian Church. Here, too, we meet with multiplied coincidences. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say, that the worship of the Church was identical with that of the synagogue, modified (1) by the new truths, (2) by the new institution of the Supper of the Lord, (3) by the spiritual *Charismata*.

From the synagogue came the use of fixed forms of prayer. To that the first disciples had been accustomed from their youth. They had asked their Master to give them a distinctive one, and he had complied with their request,²⁴ as the Baptist had done before for his disciples, as every Rabbi did for his. The forms might be, and were, abused; but for the disciples this was, as yet, the true pattern of devotion, and their Master sanctioned it. To their minds there would seem nothing inconsistent with true heart worship in the recurrence of a fixed order,²⁵ of the same prayers, hymns, doxologies, such as all liturgical study leads us to think of as existing in the Apostolic Age.

The large admixture of a didactic element in Christian worship, that by which it was distinguished from all Gentile forms of adoration, was derived from the older order. "Moses" was "read in the synagogues every Sabbath-day,"²⁶ the whole Law being read consecutively, so as to be completed, according to one cycle, in three years, or according to that which ultimately prevailed, and determined the existing divisions of the Hebrew text, in the 52 weeks of a single year. The writings of the Prophets were read as second lessons in a corresponding order. They were followed by

²⁰ Rev. i. 20, ii. 1.

²¹ Eph. iv. 11; 1 Pet. v. 1.

²² Heb. xiii. 7.

²³ Acts xix. 14.

²⁴ Luke xi. 1.

²⁵ Κατὰ τάξιν, 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

²⁶ Acts xv. 21.

the *Derash*, "the word of exhortation,"²⁷ the exposition, the sermon of the synagogue. The first Christian synagogues, we must believe, followed this order with but little deviation. It remained for them before long to add "the other Scriptures," which they had learned to recognize as more precious even than the Law itself, the "prophetic word" of the New Testament. The synagogue use of Psalms again, on the plan of selecting those which had a special fitness for special times, answered to that which appears to have prevailed in the Church of the first three centuries.

The conformity extends also to the times of prayer. In the hours of service this was obviously the case. The third, sixth, and ninth hours were, in the times of the New Testament,²⁸ and had been probably for some time before,²⁹ the fixed times of devotion. The same hours, it is well known, were recognized in the Church of the second, probably in that of the first century also.³⁰ The sacred days belonging to the two systems seem, at first, to present a contrast rather than a resemblance; but here too there is a symmetry which points to an original connection. The solemn days of the synagogue were the second, the fifth, and the seventh, the last or Sabbath being the conclusion of the whole. In whatever way the change was brought about, the transfer of the sanctity of the Sabbath to the Lord's Day involved a corresponding change in the order of the week, and the first, the fourth, and the sixth became to the Christian society what the other days had been to the Jewish.

§ 8. The language of the New Testament shows that the officers of the synagogue exercised in certain cases a judicial power. The synagogue itself was the place of trial;³¹ even, strange as it may seem, of the actual punishment of scourging.³² They do not appear to have had the right of inflicting any severer penalty, unless, under this head, we may include that of excommunication, or "putting a man out of the synagogue,"³³ placing him under an anathema,³⁴ "delivering him to Satan."³⁵ In some cases they exercised the right, even outside the limits of Palestine, of seizing the persons of the accused, and sending them in chains to take their trial before the Supreme Council at Jerusalem.³⁶

It is not quite so easy, however, to define the nature of the tribunal, and the precise limits of its jurisdiction. In two of the passages referred to³⁷ they are carefully distinguished from the *Councils*, yet both appear as instruments by which the spirit of religious persecution might fasten on its victims. The explanation commonly given, that the council sat in the synagogue and was thus identified with it, is hardly satisfactory. It seems more probable that the council was the larger tribunal of 23, which sat in every city, identical with that of the seven, with two Levites as assessors to each, which Josephus describes as acting in the smaller provincial towns,³⁸ and that under the term synagogue we are to understand a smaller court, probably that of the ten judges mentioned in the Talmud, consisting either of the elders, the *chazzân*, and the *legatus*, or otherwise of the ten *Battanim*, or *Otiosi*.

Here, also, we trace the outline of a Christian institution. The Church,

²⁷ Acts xlii. 15. ²⁸ Acts, iii. 1, x. 3, 9.

²⁹ Ps. iv. 17; Dan. vi. 10.

³⁰ Clem. Al. *Strom.* i. c.; Tertull. *De*
Orat. c. xxv.

³¹ Luke xli. 11, xxi. 12.

³² Matt. x. 17; Mark xiii. 9.

³³ John xii. 42, xvi. 2.

³⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9.

³⁵ 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20.

³⁶ Acts ix. 2, xxii. 5.

³⁷ Matt. x. 17; Mark xiii. 9.

³⁸ Ant. iv. 8, § 14; B. J. ii. 20, § 5.

either by itself or by appointed delegates, was to act as a Court of Arbitration in all disputes among its members. The elders of the Church were not, however, to descend to the trivial disputes of daily life. For these, any men of common sense and fairness, however destitute of official honor and position, would be enough.³⁹ For the elders, as for those of the synagogue, were reserved the graver offenses against religion and morals. In such cases they had power to excommunicate, to "put out of" the Church, which had taken the place of the synagogue, sometimes by their own authority, sometimes with the consent of the whole society.⁴⁰

³⁹ 1 Cor. vi. 1-8.

⁴⁰ 1 Cor. v. 4.

SECTION IV.

SECTS OF THE JEWS.

§ 1. Origin and name of the Jewish sects. The term Heresy. Three chief sects. § 2. I. PHARISES—Their name and origin. § 3. Their fundamental doctrines. Belief in an Oral Law. § 4. In a future state. § 5. Their proselytizing spirit. § 6. II. SADDUCEES—Their name and origin. § 7. Their fundamental doctrines. Denial of an oral law. § 8. Denial of a resurrection of the dead. § 9. Belief in the freedom of the will. § 10. Supposed rejection of all Scripture except the Pentateuch. § 11. Their disappearance. § 12. III. ESEENES—Their name, organization, and doctrines. § 13. THE SCRIBES.

§ 1. THE division of the Jewish people into religious parties, following teachers of different schools of theological opinion, is a phenomenon peculiar to the age subsequent to the Captivity. In the ritualism of the Mosaic law there was scarcely any scope left for opinion, and, at all events, we find little if any trace of a tendency to discuss the foundations of the Law on the one hand, or to speculate on its developments. The actual division was a stern conflict between obedience to the law of God, and the open rebellion of idolatry; between prophets truly inspired by Jehovah, and those who spoke falsely in his name; between the fidelity of religious patriotism, and the parties that were ever for leaning to Egypt and Assyria.

The cessation of idolatry, and the more thoughtful and spiritual character which the Jewish religion assumed after the Captivity, gave freer scope to the speculative element. The contact with foreign modes of thought must also have had no small influence; but still it is one of the obscurest parts of this difficult subject, to trace back any specific tenets of the different parties, that were formed during the Asmonæan period, to oriental ideas imbibed during the Captivity, on the one hand, or to Hellenistic philosophy on the other. Especially must we be careful not to confound the "opposition party" in theology—the Sadducees—with the unpatriotic Hellenizers, who were hateful alike to all who had any regard to the law of Moses and the worship of Jehovah.

In one point, at least, there was a resemblance between the religious parties of the Jews and the philosophic schools of the Greeks; the name used

to denote the latter was applied to the former. That name is the Greek word, of which the English form is *heresy*;¹ but the English translation, in the indifferent sense now referred to, is borrowed from the Latin *sect*.² Thus we read in the *Acts of the Apostles* (v. 17), of "the *sect* (αἵρεσις) of the Sadducees," and "the *sect* of the Pharisees" (xv. 5). When St. Paul was charged with being "a ringleader of the *sect* (heresy) of the Nazarenes," his reply proves that he knew the term to be used in an opprobrious sense:—"This I confess unto thee, after *the way which they call heresy*, so worship I the God of my fathers;"³ and the Apostle himself, as well as Peter, uses the term in that condemnatory sense, in which it has passed into ecclesiastical language.

The chief sects among the Jews were the PHARISEES, the SADDUCEES, and the ESSENES; who may be described respectively as the *Formalists*, the *Free-thinkers*, and the *Puritans*; but it must be remembered that such brief general characteristics are of necessity extremely vague. Of the *Herodians*, who can not properly be called a *sect*, we have already had occasion to speak.⁴

§ 2. The PHARISEES are so called from *Perishim*, the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word *Perushim*, "separated." The name does not occur either in the Old Testament or in the Apocrypha; but it is usually considered that the Pharisees were essentially the same with the Assidæans (i. e. *chasidim* = godly men, saints) mentioned in the Books of Maccabees.⁵

A knowledge of the opinions and practices of this party at the time of Christ is of great importance for entering deeply into the genius of the Christian religion. A cursory perusal of the Gospel is sufficient to show that Christ's teaching was in some respects thoroughly antagonistic to theirs. He denounced them in the bitterest language.⁶ Indeed, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, that his repeated denunciations of the Pharisees mainly exasperated them into taking measures for causing his death; so that in one sense he may be said to have shed his blood, and to have laid down his life in protesting against their practice and spirit.⁷ Hence, to understand the Pharisees is, by contrast, an aid toward understanding the spirit of uncorrupted Christianity.

§ 3. The doctrines of the Pharisees are contained in the *Mishna*, of which an account has been already given.⁸ It has been there shown that the fundamental principle of the Pharisees is, that by the side of the written law there was an *oral law to complete and to explain the written law*, given to Moses on Mount Sinai, and transmitted by him by word of mouth.

It is not to be supposed that all the traditions which bound the Pharisees were believed to be direct revelations to Moses on Mount Sinai. In addition to such revelations, which were not disputed, there were three other classes of traditions. 1st. Opinions on disputed points, which were the re-

¹ Αἵρεσις, literally, *choice*; hence, a *philosophic principle*, and even a particular *course of study*. For example, we have not only αἵρεσις Στωική for the *Stoic sect*, but (in Polybius) αἵρεσις Ἑλληνική for the *study of Greek history*. In Acts xxvi. 5, the word is evidently used in the abstract for a *set of principles*, though with an implied reference to the *party* which held those principles in their greatest strictness: "after the most straitest *sect of our religion* (κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας) I lived a Pharisee."

² The Latin word *secta* signifies a *beaten path*; and its use in this connection is analogous to that of ὁδός in the N. T., applied especially to the Christians, e. g. Acts ix. 2, "any of *the way*" (τιναὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας).

³ Acts xxiv. 5, 14. Comp. Acts xxviii. 22.

⁴ See p. 93.

⁵ See further on the Assidæans, p. 25.

⁶ See Matt. xv. 7, 8, xxiii. 5, 13, 14, 15, 23; Mark vii. 6; Luke xi. 42-44, and compare Matt. vii. 1-5, xl. 29, xii. 19, 30; Luke vi. 28, 37-43. ⁷ See especially Luke xi. 53, 54.

⁸ See p. 151.

sult of a majority of votes. 2dly. Decrees made by prophets and wise men in different ages, in conformity with a saying attributed to the men of the Great Synagogue, "Be deliberate in judgment; train up many disciples; and *make a fence for the law.*" These carried prohibitions farther than the written law or oral law of Moses, in order to protect the Jewish people from temptations to sin or pollution. 3dly. Legal decisions of proper ecclesiastical authorities on disputed questions. However, although in these several ways *all* the traditions of the Pharisees were not deemed direct revelations from Jehovah, there is no doubt that all became invested, more or less, with a peculiar sanctity; so that, regarded collectively, the study of them and the observance of them became as imperative as the study and observance of the precepts in the Bible.

Viewed as a whole, they treated men like children, formalizing and defining the minutest particulars of ritual observances. The expressions of "bondage," of "weak and beggarly elements," and of "burdens too heavy for men to bear," faithfully represent the impression produced by their multiplicity. An elaborate argument might be advanced for many of them individually, but the sting of them consisted in their aggregate number, which would have a tendency to quench the fervor and the freshness of a spiritual religion.⁹

In order to observe regulations on points of this kind, the Pharisees formed a kind of society. A member was called a *châbér*, and those among the middle and lower classes who were not members were called "the people of the land," or the vulgar. Each member undertook, in the presence of three other members, that he would remain true to the laws of the association. The conditions were various. One of transcendent importance was that a member should refrain from every thing that was not tithed.¹⁰ The Mishna says, "He who undertakes to be *trustworthy* (a word with a technical Pharisaical meaning) tithes whatever he eats, and whatever he sells, and whatever he buys, and *does not eat and drink with the people of the land.*" This was a point of peculiar delicacy, for the portion of produce reserved as tithes for the priests and Levites was *holy*, and the enjoyment of what was holy was a deadly sin. Hence a Pharisee was bound, not only to ascertain as a buyer whether the articles which he purchased had been duly tithed, but to have the same certainty in regard to what he ate in his own house and when taking his meals with others. And thus Christ, in eating with publicans and sinners, ran counter to the first principles, and shocked the most deeply-rooted prejudices of Pharisaism; for, independently of other obvious considerations, he ate and drank with "the people of the land," and it would have been assumed as undoubted that he partook on such occasions of food which had not been duly tithed.

Perhaps some of the most characteristic laws of the Pharisees related to what was clean and unclean. According to the Levitical law, every unclean person was cut off from all religious privileges, and was regarded as defiling the sanctuary of Jehovah.¹¹ On principles precisely similar to those of the Levitical laws,¹² it was possible to incur these awful religious penalties either by *eating* or by *touching* what was unclean in the Pharisaical sense. One point alone raised an insuperable barrier between the free so-

⁹ For illustrative particulars, especially with regard to the observance of the Sabbath, see the *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 824.

¹⁰ Comp. Matt. xxiii. 23, and Luke xviii. 12.

¹¹ Num. xix. 20.

¹² Lev. xx. 95, xxii. 4-7.

cial intercourse of Jews and other nations. This point is, "that *any thing* slaughtered by a heathen should be deemed unfit to be eaten, like the carcase of an animal that had died of itself, and like such carcase should pollute the person who carried it." On the reasonable assumption that under such circumstances animals used for food would be killed by Jewish slaughterers, regulations the most minute are laid down for their guidance. In reference, likewise, to *touching* what is unclean, the Mishna abounds with prohibitions and distinctions no less minute; and by far the greatest portion of the 6th and last "Order" relates to impurities contracted in this manner. Referring to that "Order" for details, it may be observed that to any one fresh from the perusal of them, and of others already adverted to, the words, "Touch not, taste not, handle not," seem a correct but almost a pale summary of their drift and purpose;¹³ and the stern antagonism becomes vividly visible between them and Him who proclaimed boldly that a man was defiled not by any thing he ate, but by the bad thoughts of the heart alone;¹⁴ and who, even when the guest of a Pharisee, pointedly abstained from washing his hands before a meal, in order to rebuke the superstition which attached a moral value to such a ceremonial act.¹⁵

It is proper to add, that it would be a great mistake to suppose that the Pharisees were wealthy and luxurious, much more that they had degenerated into the vices which were imputed to some of the Roman popes and cardinals during the 200 years preceding the Reformation. Josephus compared the Pharisees to the sect of the Stoics. He says that they lived frugally, in no respect giving in to luxury, but that they followed the leadership of reason in what it had selected and transmitted as a good.¹⁶ With this agrees what he states in another passage, that the Pharisees had so much weight with the multitude, that if they said any thing against a king or a high-priest they were at once believed;¹⁷ for this kind of influence is more likely to be obtained by a religious body over the people, through austerity and self-denial, than through wealth, luxury and self-indulgence. Although there would be hypocrites among them, it would be unreasonable to charge all the Pharisees as a body with hypocrisy, in the sense wherein we at the present day use the word. But at any rate they must be regarded as having been some of the most intense *formalists* whom the world has ever seen; and, looking at the average standard of excellence among mankind, it is nearly certain that men whose lives were spent in the ceremonial observances of the Mishna would cherish feelings of self-complacency and spiritual pride not justified by intrinsic moral excellence. The supercilious contempt toward the poor publican, and toward the tender penitent love that bathed Christ's feet with tears, would be the natural result of such a system of life.

It was alleged against them, on the highest spiritual authority, that they "made the word of God of no effect by their traditions." This would be true in the largest sense, from the purest form of religion in the Old Testament being almost incompatible with such endless forms;¹⁸ but it was true in another sense, from some of the traditions being decidedly at variance with genuine religion. The evasions connected with Corban are well known, and others equally striking might be added from the Mishna.

¹³ Col. ii. 21.

¹⁴ Matt. xv. 11.

¹⁵ See Luke xi. 37-40.

¹⁶ Ant. xviii. 1, § 3.

¹⁷ Ant. xiii. 10, § 5.

¹⁸ Mic. vi. 8.

§ 4. One of the fundamental doctrines of the Pharisees was a *belief in a future state*. They appear to have believed in a resurrection of the dead, very much in the same sense as the early Christians. This is in accordance with St. Paul's statement to the chief priests and council,¹⁹ that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, and that he was called in question for the hope and resurrection of the dead; and it is likewise almost implied in Christ's teaching, which does not insist on the doctrine of a future life as any thing new, but assumes it as already adopted by his hearers, except by the Sadducees, although he condemns some unspiritual conceptions of its nature as erroneous.²⁰

§ 5. In reference to the *spirit of proselytism* among the Pharisees, there is indisputable authority for the statement that it prevailed to a very great extent at the time of Christ;²¹ and attention is now called to it on account of its probable importance in having paved the way for the early diffusion of Christianity. Through kidnapping,²² through leading into captivity by military incursions and victorious enemies,²³ through flight,²⁴ through commerce,²⁵ and probably through ordinary emigration, Jews at the time of Christ had become scattered over the fairest portions of the civilized world. On the day of Pentecost, Jews are said to have been assembled with one accord in one place at Jerusalem, "from every region under heaven." Moreover, the then existing regulations or customs of synagogues afforded facilities which do not exist now, either in synagogues or Christian Churches, for presenting new views to a congregation.²⁶ Under such auspices the proselytizing spirit of the Pharisees inevitably stimulated a thirst for inquiry, and accustomed the Jews to theological controversies. Thus there existed precedents and favoring circumstances for efforts to make proselytes, when the greatest of all missionaries, a Jew by race, a Pharisee by education, a Greek by language, and a Roman citizen by birth, preaching the resurrection of Jesus to those who for the most part already believed in the resurrection of the dead, confronted the elaborate ritual-system of the written and oral law by a pure spiritual religion; and thus obtained the co-operation of many Jews themselves in breaking down every barrier between Jew, Pharisee, Greek, and Roman, and in endeavoring to unite all mankind by the brotherhood of a common Christianity.

§ 6. II. The SADDUCEES.²⁷ Although frequently mentioned in the New Testament in conjunction with the Pharisees, they do not throw such vivid light as their great antagonists on the real significance of Christianity. Except on one occasion, when they united with the Pharisees in insidiously asking for a sign from heaven,²⁸ Christ never assailed the Sadducees with the same bitter denunciations which he uttered against the Pharisees; and they do not, like the Pharisees, seem to have taken active measures for causing him to be put to death. In this respect, and in many others, they have not been so influential as the Pharisees in the world's history; but still they deserve attention, as representing Jewish ideas before the Phari-

¹⁹ Acts xxiii. 6.

²⁰ Matt. xxii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 34-36.

²¹ Matt. xxiii. 15. Comp. pp. 148, 149.

²² Joel iii. 6.

²³ 2 K. xvii. 6, xviii. 11, xxiv. 15; Am. i. 6, 9.

²⁴ Jer. xliii. 4-7.

²⁵ Joseph. Ant. xx. 2, § 3.

²⁶ Acts xvii. 2; Luke iv. 16.

²⁷ Matt. iii. 7, xvi. 1, 6, 11, 12, xxii. 28, 34; Mark xii. 18; Luke xx. 27; Acts iv. 1, v. 17, xxxiii. 6, 7, 8.

²⁸ Matt. xvi. 1, 4, 6.

sees became triumphant, and as illustrating one phase of Jewish thought at the time of the promulgation of Christianity.

The origin of their name is involved in great difficulties. The Hebrew word by which they are called in the Mishna is *Tsedukim*, the plural of *Tsedék*, which undoubtedly means "just," or "righteous," but which is never used in the Bible except as a proper name, and in the English Version is always translated "Zadoc."²⁰ The most obvious translation of the word, therefore, is to call them Zadocs or Zadokites; and a question would then arise as to why they were so called. The ordinary Jewish statement is that they are named from a certain Zadoc, a disciple of that Antigonus of Socho, who is mentioned in the Mishna as having received the oral law from Simon the Just, the last of the men of the Great Synagogue; but it is certain that this statement must be rejected.²¹ As recourse is had to conjecture, the first point to be considered is whether the word is likely to have arisen from the meaning of "righteousness," or from the name of an individual. This must be decided in favor of the latter alternative, inasmuch as the word Zadok, as we have already seen, never occurs in the Bible, except as a proper name; and then we are led to inquire as to who the Zadok of the Sadducees is likely to have been. Now, there was one Zadok of transcendent importance, and only one: viz., the priest who acted such a prominent part at the time of David, and who declared in favor of Solomon, when Abiathar took the part of Adonijah as successor to the throne.²² His line of priests appears to have had decided pre-eminence in subsequent history. Thus, in Ezekiel's prophetic vision of the future Temple, "the sons of Zadok," and "the priests the Levites of the seed of Zadok" are spoken of with peculiar honor, as those who kept the charge of the sanctuary of Jehovah, when the children of Israel went astray.²³ Now, as the transition from the expression "sons of Zadok," and "priests of the seed of Zadok" to Zadokites is easy and obvious, and as in the Acts of the Apostles, v. 17, it is said, "*Then the high-priest rose, and all they that were with him, which is the sect of the Sadducees, and were filled with indignation,*" it has been conjectured that the Sadducees or Zadokites were originally identical with the sons of Zadok, and constituted what may be termed a kind of sacerdotal aristocracy. To these were afterward attached all who for any reason reckoned themselves as belonging to the aristocracy; such, for example, as the families of the high-priests who had obtained consideration under the dynasty of Herod. These were for the most part judges, and individuals of the official and governing class. Now, although this view of the Sadducees is only inferential, and mainly conjectural, it certainly explains the name better than any other, and elucidates at once in the Acts of the Apostles the otherwise obscure statement that the high-priest, and those who were with him, were the sect of the Sadducees.

§ 7. The leading tenet of the Sadducees was *the negation of the leading tenet of their opponents*. As the Pharisees asserted, so the Sadducees denied, that the Israelites were in possession of an Oral Law transmitted to them by Moses. In opposition to the Pharisees, they maintained that the written law alone was obligatory on the nation, as of divine authority.

²⁰ 2 K. xv. 33; 2 Sam. viii. 17; 1 Chr. vi. 8, 18, etc.; Neh. iii. 4, 29, xi. 11.

²¹ See *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 1081. 11.

²² 1 K. i. 32-45.

²³ Ez. xl. 46, xlii. 19, xlii. 15, xlviii.

It must not be assumed that the Sadducees, because they rejected a Mosaic Oral Law, rejected likewise all traditions and all decisions in explanation of passages in the Pentateuch. Although they protested against the assertion that such points had been divinely settled by Moses, they probably, in numerous instances, followed practically the same traditions as the Pharisees.

§ 8. The second distinguishing doctrine of the Sadducees, the *denial of man's resurrection after death*, followed in their conceptions as a logical conclusion from their denial that Moses had revealed to the Israelites the Oral Law. For on a point so momentous as a second life beyond the grave, no religious party among the Jews would have deemed themselves bound to accept any doctrine as an article of faith, unless it had been proclaimed by Moses, their great legislator; and it is certain that in the written Law of the Pentateuch there is a total absence of any assertion by Moses of the resurrection of the dead. This fact is presented to Christians in a striking manner by the well-known words of the Pentateuch which are quoted by Christ in argument with the Sadducees on this subject.³³ It can not be doubted that in such a case Christ would quote to his powerful adversaries the most cogent text in the Law; and yet the text actually quoted does not do more than suggest an *inference* on this great doctrine. It is true that in other parts of the Old Testament there are individual passages which express a belief in a resurrection, such as in Is. xxvi. 19, Dan. xii. 2, Job xix. 26, and in some of the Psalms; and it may at first sight be a subject of surprise that the Sadducees were not convinced by the authority of those passages. But although the Sadducees regarded the books which contained these passages as sacred, it is more than doubtful whether any of the Jews regarded them as sacred in precisely the same sense as the written Law.

In connection with the disbelief of a resurrection by the Sadducees, it is proper to notice the statement³⁴ that they likewise denied there was "angel or spirit." A perplexity arises as to the precise sense in which this denial is to be understood. Angels are so distinctly mentioned in the Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament, that it is hard to understand how those who acknowledged the Old Testament to have divine authority could deny the existence of angels.³⁵ The two principal explanations which have been suggested are either that the Sadducees regarded the angels of the Old Testament as transitory, unsubstantial representations of Jehovah, or that they disbelieved, not the angels of the Old Testament, but merely the angelical system which had become developed in the popular belief of the Jews after their return from the Babylonian captivity. Either of these explanations may possibly be correct; and the first, although there are numerous texts to which it did not apply, would have received some countenance from passages wherein the same divine appearance, which at one time is called the "angel of Jehovah," is afterward called simply "Jehovah."³⁶

§ 9. Josephus states that the Sadducees believed in the *freedom of the*

³³ Ex. iii. 6, 16; Mark xii. 26, 27; Matt. xxii. 81, 82; Luke xx. 87.

³⁴ Acts xxiii. 8.

³⁵ See Gen. xvi. 7, xix. 1, xxii. 11, xxviii. 13; Ex. xxiii. 20; Num. xxii. 23; Judg.

xiii. 18; 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, and other passages.

³⁶ Gen. xvi. 7, 13, xxii. 11, 12, xxxi. 1, 16; Ex. iii. 2, 4; Judg. vi. 14, 23, xiii. 18, 22.

will, which the Pharisees denied. Possibly the great stress laid by the Sadducees on the freedom of the will may have had some connection with their forming such a large portion of that class from which criminal judges were selected. Those Jews who were almost exclusively religious teachers would naturally insist on the inability of man to do any thing good if God's Holy Spirit were taken away from him,²⁷ and would enlarge on the perils which surrounded man from the temptations of Satan and evil angels or spirits.²⁸ But it is likely that the tendencies of the judicial class would be more practical and direct.

§ 10. Some of the early Christian writers attribute to the Sadducees the *rejection of all the Sacred Scriptures except the Pentateuch*. Such rejection, if true, would undoubtedly constitute a most important additional difference between the Sadducees and Pharisees. The statement of these Christian writers is, however, now generally admitted to have been founded on a misconception of the truth, and it seems to have arisen from a confusion of the Sadducees with the Samaritans.

§ 11. An important fact in the history of the Sadducees is their *rapid disappearance from history after the first century*, and the subsequent predominance among the Jews of the opinions of the Pharisees. Two circumstances, indirectly but powerfully, contributed to produce this result: 1st. The state of the Jews after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus; and 2dly. The growth of the Christian religion. As to the first point, it is difficult to overestimate the consternation and dismay which the destruction of Jerusalem occasioned in the minds of sincerely religious Jews. In this their hour of darkness and anguish, they naturally turned to the consolations and hopes of a future state; and the doctrine of the Sadducees, that there was nothing beyond the present life, would have appeared to them cold, heartless, and hateful. Again, while they were sunk in the lowest depths of depression, a new religion, which they despised as a heresy and a superstition, was gradually making its way among the subjects of their detested conquerors, the Romans. One of the causes of its success was undoubtedly the vivid belief in the resurrection of Jesus, and a consequent resurrection of all mankind, which was accepted by its heathen converts with a passionate earnestness, of which those who at the present day are familiar from infancy with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead can form only a faint idea. To attempt to check the progress of this new religion among the Jews by an appeal to the temporary rewards and punishments of the Pentateuch, would have been as idle as an endeavor to check an explosive power by ordinary mechanical restraints. Consciously, therefore, or unconsciously, many circumstances combined to induce the Jews who were not Pharisees, but who resisted the new heresy, to rally round the standard of the Oral Law, and to assert that their holy legislator, Moses, had transmitted to his faithful people by word of mouth, although not in writing, the revelation of a future state of rewards and punishments.

§ 12. III. THE ESSENES. This sect is represented by Josephus as combining the ascetic virtues of the Pythagoreans and Stoics with a spiritual knowledge of the Divine Law. The origin of their name is quite uncertain, and the various derivations that have been proposed for it are all more or less open to objection.

²⁷ Ps. 11, 12.

²⁸ 1 Chr. xxi. 1; Tob. iii. 17.

Their obscurity as a distinct body arises from the fact that they represented originally a tendency rather than an organization. The communities which were formed out of them were a result of their practice, and not a necessary part of it. As a sect they were distinguished by an aspiration after ideal purity rather than by any special code of doctrines; and like the Chasidim of earlier times, they were confounded in the popular estimation with the great body of the zealous observers of the Law (Pharisees). The growth of Essenism was a natural result of the religious feeling which was called out by the circumstances of the Greek dominion; and it is easy to trace the process by which it was matured. From the Maccabæan age there was a continuous effort among the stricter Jews to attain an absolute standard of holiness. Each class of devotees was looked upon as practically impure by their successors, who carried the laws of purity still further; and the Essenes stand at the extreme limit of the mystic ascetism which was thus gradually reduced to shape. The associations of the "Scribes and Pharisees," "*the companions, the wise,*" gave place to others bound by a more rigid rule; and the rule of the Essenes was made gradually stricter. Judas, the earliest Essene who is mentioned (ab. 110 B.C.), appears living in ordinary society.³⁹ But by a natural impulse, the Essenes withdrew from the dangers and distractions of business. From the cities they retired to the wilderness, to realize the conceptions of religion which they formed, but still they remained on the whole true to their ancient faith. To the Pharisees they stood nearly in the same relation as that in which the Pharisees themselves stood with regard to the mass of the people. The differences lay mainly in rigor of practice, and not in articles of belief.

The traces of the existence of Essenes in common society are not wanting, nor confined to individual cases. Not only was a gate at Jerusalem named from them,⁴⁰ but a later tradition mentions the existence of a congregation there which devoted "one-third of the day to study, one-third to prayer, and one-third to labor." Those, again, whom Josephus speaks of as allowing marriage, may be supposed to have belonged to such bodies as had not yet withdrawn from intercourse with their fellow-men. But the practice of the extreme section was afterward regarded as characteristic of the whole class, and the isolated communities of Essenes furnished the type which is preserved in the popular descriptions. These were regulated by strict rules, analogous to those of the monastic institutions of a later date. The candidate for admission first passed through a year's novitiate, in which he received, as symbolic gifts, an axe, an apron, and a white robe, and gave proof of his temperance by observing the ascetic rules of the order. At the close of this probation, his character was submitted to a fresh trial of two years, and meanwhile he shared in the lustral rites of the initiated, but not in their meals. The full membership was imparted at the end of this second period, when the novice bound himself by "awful oaths"—though oaths were absolutely forbidden at all other times—to observe piety, justice, obedience, honesty, and secrecy, "preserving alike the books of their sect, and *the names of the angels.*"⁴¹

The order itself was regulated by an internal jurisdiction. Excommunication was equivalent to a slow death, since an Essene could not take

³⁹ Joseph. B. J. i. 3, § 5.

⁴⁰ Joseph. B. J. v. 4, § 2, Ἐσσηνῶν πύλη.

⁴¹ Joseph. B. J. ii. 8, § 7.

food prepared by strangers for fear of pollution. All things were held in common, without distinction of property or house; and special provision was made for the relief of the poor. Self-denial, temperance, and labor—especially agriculture—were the marks of the outward life of the Essenes; purity and divine communion the objects of their aspiration. Slavery, war, and commerce were alike forbidden; and, according to Philo, their conduct generally was directed by three rules, “the love of God, the love of virtue, and the love of man.”

The number of the Essenes is roughly estimated by Philo at 4000, and Josephus says that there were “more than 4000” who observed their rule.⁴² Their best known settlements were on the N.W. shore of the Dead Sea, but others lived in scattered communities throughout Palestine, and perhaps, also, in cities.

§ 13. THE SCRIBES, though not a sect of the Jews, may be conveniently treated of in this place on account of their intimate connection with the Pharisees. The words “Scribes” and “Pharisees” are bound together in the Gospels by the closest possible alliance.⁴³ The Scribes, who were originally the secretaries of the king, became in course of time a learned class, students and interpreters of the law. The seventy years of the Captivity gave a fresh glory to the name. The exiles would be anxious above all things to preserve the sacred books, the laws, the hymns, the prophecies of the past. To know what was worth preserving, to transcribe the older Hebrew documents accurately, when the spoken language of the people was passing into Aramaic, to explain what was hard and obscure—this was what the necessities of the time demanded. The man who met them became emphatically “Ezra the Scribe,” the priestly functions falling into the background, as the priestly order itself did before the Scribes as a class. The words of Ezr. vii. 10 describe the high ideal of the new office. The Scribe is “to seek the law of the Lord and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments.” Of the time that followed we have but scanty records. The Scribes’ office apparently became more and more prominent. They appear as a distinct class, “the families of the Scribes,” with a local habitation.⁴⁴ They compile, as in the two Books of Chronicles, *excerpta* and epitomes of larger histories.⁴⁵ It is characteristic of the Scribes of this period that, with the exception of Ezra and Zadok,⁴⁶ we have no record of their names. A later age honored them collectively as the men of the Great Synagogue. Never, perhaps, was so important a work done so silently. They devoted themselves to the careful study of the text, and laid down rules for transcribing it with the most scrupulous precision. A saying is ascribed to Simon the Just (B.C. 300–290), the last of the succession of the men of the Great Synagogue, which embodies the principle on which they acted, and enables us to trace the growth of their system. “Our fathers have taught us,” he said, “three things: to be cautious in judging, to train many scholars, and to set a fence about the Law.” They wished to make the Law of Moses the rule of life for the whole nation and for individual men. But it lies in the nature of every such law, of every informal, half-systematic code, that it raises questions which it does not solve. The Jewish teacher could recognize no principles beyond the precepts of the

⁴² *Ant.* xviii. 2, § 5.

⁴³ *Matt.* xxiii. *passim*; *Luke* v. 30.

⁴⁴ *1 Chr.* ii. 55.

⁴⁵ *1 Chr.* xxix. 20; *2 Chr.* ix. 23.

⁴⁶ *Neh.* xvii. 13.

LAW. The result showed that, in this as in other instances, the idolatry of the letter was destructive of the very reverence in which it had originated. Decisions on fresh questions were accumulated into a complex system of casuistry. The new precepts, still transmitted orally, came practically to take their place. The "Words of the Scribes," now used as a technical phrase for these decisions, were honored above the Law. It was a greater crime to offend against them than against the Law. They were as wine, while the precepts of the Law were as water. The first step was taken toward annulling the commandments of God for the sake of their own traditions. The casuistry became at once subtle and prurient, evading the plainest duties, tampering with conscience.⁴⁷ The right relation of moral and ceremonial laws was not only forgotten, but absolutely inverted. This was the result of the profound reverence for the letter which gave no heed to the "word abiding in them."⁴⁸

The teaching of the Scribes was naturally opposed to the opinions of the Sadducees. The leading tenet of the Sadducees tended, by maintaining the sufficiency of the letter of the Law,⁴⁹ to destroy the very occupation of a Scribe; and the class, as such, belonged to the party of its opponents. There were, however, within the party of the Pharisees, within the order of the Scribes, two schools with distinctly opposed tendencies, one vehemently, rigidly orthodox, the other orthodox also, but with an orthodoxy which, in the language of modern politics, might be classed as Liberal Conservative. The latter party was founded by Hillel (born about B.C. 112), while the strictly orthodox party was represented by his contemporary, Shammai. The two were held in nearly equal honor. One, in Jewish language, was the Nasi, the other the Ab-beth-din of the Sanhedrim. They did not teach, however, as their predecessors had done, in entire harmony with each other. The points on which they differed were almost innumerable. In most of them, questions as to the causes and degrees of uncleanness, as to the law of contracts or of wills, we can find little or no interest. On the former class of subjects the school of Shammai represented the extremest development of the Pharisaic spirit. The teaching of Hillel showed some capacity for wider thoughts. He was the first to lay down principles for an equitable construction of the Law with a dialectic precision which seems almost to imply a Greek culture. The genial character of the man comes out in some of his sayings, which remind us of the tone of Jesus the son of Sirach, and present some faint approximations to a higher teaching. The contrast showed itself in the conduct of the followers not less than in the teachers. The disciples of Shammai were conspicuous for their fierceness, appealed to popular passions, and used the sword to decide their controversies. Out of that school grew the party of the Zealots, fierce, fanatical, vindictive, the Orangemen of Pharisaism. Those of Hillel were like their master, cautious, gentle, tolerant, unwilling to make enemies, content to let things take their course. One sought to impose upon the proselyte from heathenism the full burden of the Law, the other that he should be treated with some sympathy and indulgence. The teaching of our Lord must have appeared to men different in many ways from both. While the Scribes repeated the traditions of the elders, He "spoke as one

⁴⁷ Matt. xv. 1-6; xxiii. 16-23.

Talmud. See above, p. 151.

⁴⁸ John v. 38. Their teaching is contained in the⁴⁹ See p. 169.

having authority," "not as the Scribes."⁵⁰ While they confined their teaching to the class of scholars, He "had compassion on the multitudes."⁵¹ While they were to be found only in the council or in their schools, He journeyed through the cities and villages.⁵² While they spoke of the kingdom of God vaguely, as a thing far off, He proclaimed that it had already come nigh to men.⁵³ But in most of the points at issue between the two parties, He must have appeared in direct antagonism to the school of Shammai, in sympathy with that of Hillel. So far, on the other hand, as the temper of the Hillel school was one of mere adaptation to the feeling of the people, cleaving to tradition, wanting in the intuition of a higher life, the teaching of Christ must have been felt, as unsparingly condemning it. It adds to the interest of this inquiry to remember that Hillel himself lived, according to the tradition of the Rabbis, to the great age of 120, and may therefore have been present among the doctors of Luke ii. 46. Gamaliel, his grandson and successor,⁵⁴ was at the head of this school during the whole of the ministry of Christ, as well as in the early portion of the history of the Acts. We are thus able to explain the fact, which so many passages in the Gospels lead us to infer,—the existence all along of a party among the Scribes themselves, more or less disposed to recognize Jesus of Nazareth as a teacher,⁵⁵ not far from the kingdom of God,⁵⁶ advocates of a policy of toleration;⁵⁷ but, on the other hand, timid and time-serving, unable to confess even their half-belief,⁵⁸ afraid to take their stand against the strange alliance of extremes which brought together the Sadducean section of the priesthood and the ultra-Pharisaic party. When the last great crisis came, they apparently contented themselves with a policy of absence.⁵⁹

The special training for a Scribe's office began, probably, about the age of thirteen. The boy who was destined by his parents to the calling of a Scribe, went to Jerusalem, and applied for admission to the school of some famous Rabbi. The master and his scholars met; the former sitting on a high chair, the elder pupils on a lower bench, the younger on the ground, both literally "at his feet." The education was chiefly catechetical, the pupil submitting cases and asking questions, the teacher examining the pupil.⁶⁰ After a sufficient period of training, probably at the age of thirty, the probationer was solemnly admitted to his office.

There still remained for the disciple, after his admission, the choice of a variety of functions, the chances of failure and success. He might give himself to any one of the branches of study, or combine two or more of them. He might rise to high places, become a doctor of the law, an arbitrator in family litigations,⁶¹ the head of a school, a member of the Sanhedrim. He might have to content himself with the humbler work of a transcriber, copying the Law and the Prophets for the use of synagogues, or a notary writing out contracts of sale, covenants of espousals, bills of repudiation. The position of the more fortunate was of course attractive enough. In our Lord's time the passion for distinction was insatiable. The ascending scale of Rab, Rabbi, Rabban, presented so many steps on the ladder of ambition. Other forms of worldliness were not far off. The salutations

⁵⁰ Matt. vii. 29: comp. the constantly recurring "I say unto you."

⁵¹ Matt. ix. 36.

⁵² Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, etc., etc.

⁵³ Matt. iv. 17.

⁵⁴ Rabbi Simeon, the father of Gamaliel,

came between them, but apparently for a short time only.

⁵⁵ John iii. 1; Mark x. 17.

⁵⁶ Mark xii. 34.

⁵⁷ John vii. 51.

⁵⁸ John xii. 42.


⁵⁹ Luke xxiii. 50, 51.

⁶⁰ Luke ii. 43.

⁶¹ Luke xii. 14.

in the market-place,⁶² the reverential kias offered by the scholars to their master, or by Rabbis to each other, the greeting of Abba, father,⁶³ the long robes with the broad, blue fringe (the *κράσπεδον* of Matt. xxiii. 5), all these go to make up the picture of a Scribe's life. Drawing to themselves, as they did, nearly all the energy and thought of Judaism, the close hereditary caste of the priesthood was powerless to compete with them. Unless the priest became a Scribe also, he remained in obscurity. The order, as such, became contemptible and base. For the Scribes there were the best places at feasts, the chief seats in synagogues.⁶⁴

⁶² Matt. xxiii. 7.⁶³ Matt. xxiii. 9.⁶⁴ Matt. xxiii. 6 ; Luke xiv. 7.



Bethlehem.

BOOK II.

THE HISTORY OF JESUS CHRIST; OR, THE REVELATION OF THE GOSPEL.

CHAPTER VI.

BIRTH AND EARLY LIFE OF JOHN AND JESUS. B.C. 5—A.D. 26.

- § 1. Beginning of the Gospel History according to the Four Evangelists. § 2. St. John's doctrine of the WORLD. The eternal purpose of Redemption, and its revelation in God manifest in the flesh. § 3. St. Luke's beginning of the History. Zacharias and Elizabeth. Mary and Joseph. The births of John and Jesus announced by the angel Gabriel. Salutation of Mary by Elizabeth. § 4. Birth and youth of John the Baptist. Prophecy of Zacharias. § 5. The angel appears to Joseph. The Miraculous Conception. § 6. Joseph and Mary go to Bethlehem. BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST. Adoration of the Shepherds. § 7. The Circumcision and Presentation in the Temple. Simeon and Anna. § 8. Adoration of the Magi. Massacre of Bethlehem. Flight to Egypt. Death of Herod and accession of Archelaus. Return of the

Holy Family to Nazareth. § 9. Jesus in the Temple at the Passover at the age of twelve. § 10. His abode at Nazareth till his thirtieth year. His outer and inner life during this period.

§ 1. THE HISTORY OF THE NEW COVENANT divides itself into two chief parts:—*The Revelation of the Gospel* by Jesus Christ, including the accomplishment of his work of redemption; and the *Propagation of the Gospel*, and full establishment of the Christian Church, after his ascension.

The former history is written in the “Gospels” of the “Four Evangelists,” the respective openings of which furnish us with four different, but almost equally important, starting-points for all that follows. ST. MATTHEW, who writes with the most constant reference to the fulfillment of prophecy, begins by showing that Jesus Christ was, by his reputed father Joseph, the son of David, and the son of Abraham; the predicted king of the royal line of Judah; the promised seed, in whom all kindreds of the earth were to be blessed; the great object of the Covenants made by God with Abraham and with David. ST. MARK, commencing at once with the public proclamation of Christ, dates “the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God” from the ministry of John the Baptist as his forerunner. ST. LUKE places in the forefront of his narrative its practical purpose, for the instruction of a convert to Christianity, and begins “to write in order” from the birth of John the Baptist, and of Christ himself. ST. JOHN, having his mind imbued with the mysteries revealed to the “disciple whom Jesus loved,” goes back to a “beginning” antecedent to all time, and displays the eternal and divine glory of that “Life and Light,” which were manifested by Christ when he appeared on earth.

And what is true of the beginning of the Gospel history applies to each step of its subsequent development. Critics may speculate on some common remoter source of the narratives of the four evangelists, till they learn to abandon the unprofitable search: harmonists may pursue their useful labors so far as to be in danger of confounding the separate characters of the four documents in the artificial compound of their own making: but the student who rightly appreciates the purpose of God’s providence, in entrusting the record to four writers instead of one, will trace the distinct spirit of each as really his own, and will find the truest *harmony* in the concordant spiritual impression they produce, under the guidance of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

§ 2. “The Beginning” of which St. John speaks, both in

the opening of his Gospel and of his General Epistle, is the true point of view for understanding the New Covenant. In this light the histories of the two covenants open with the self-same words:—“*In the beginning ;*” and there is a closer connection between them than of language only. The God who, in the beginning of the Old Covenant, created the heaven and the earth, to be the scene of man’s probation, was the same as that divine “Word,” whose dwelling “with God,” both in essential glory and in council on men’s behalf, formed the true beginning of the Covenant of Redemption. “The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.”¹ The discussion of this “great mystery of godliness,” as a point of theological science, belongs not to the present work: we only insist on the plain truth, as the point of view from which our Saviour’s work on earth derives all its meaning. It is thus that the Apostle Paul places the same great truth before his summary of the steps by which Christ advanced from the cradle to the throne:—“Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; *God was manifested in the flesh*, justified by the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.”² The narratives of the four Evangelists fill up the outline which the Apostle draws in these few bold strokes.

Between the two points thus marked by St. John, there lies the whole preparatory training of the human race and the chosen family, with the successive steps in the revelation of the one great promise. A summary of the testimony of the Old Covenant to Christ would be no inappropriate preface to the history of the New; but having continually kept in view the evangelical aspect of the Old Covenant, and having to recur to it on the occasion of the fulfillment of the several prophecies, we may at once accompany St. Luke to the first scene of the history itself.

§ 3. In the reign of Herod the Great, there lived in Judæa an aged couple, both of them being of priestly descent, and of the most devout and blameless character, Zacharias and Elisabeth. They were childless, and Elisabeth was too old to hope for offspring. Now it came to the turn of Zacharias to fulfill his week of service in the temple, as a priest of the course of Abia or Abijah, the 8th of the courses appointed by David.³ At

¹ John i. 14.

² 1 Tim. iii. 16. Even if we admit the reading *ὅς* for *θεός*, the bearing of the passage is not materially al-

tered, considering the *personal* antecedent which the *ὅς* implies.

³ Luke i. 5-8: comp. 1 Chr. xxiv. 10; 2 Chr. viii. 14.

the solemn moment of the daily (probably the morning) sacrifice, when he had carried the blood of the lamb into the Holy Place, and the people were praying without, the angel Gabriel, the same who had foretold to Daniel the time of the Messiah, appeared to him, in the form of a man, standing by the altar of incense.⁴ He announced to Zacharias that Elisabeth should bear him a son, whose name was to be called JOHN.⁵ The vow of a Nazarite was to be upon him from the womb; and he was to discharge the very ministry which had been assigned by the prophet Malachi to Elijah, as the forerunner of the Lord.⁶ The doubts which Zacharias began to utter were silenced by the sentence of dumbness till the promise should be fulfilled; and, when he came forth, his speechless signs convinced the waiting people that he had seen some strange vision. This last point is of no little importance in connection with what we know from other sources of the state of expectation into which the Jews were now wrought, awaiting the promise of the Messiah.

Elisabeth had already been living in retirement in the hill country south of Jerusalem for five months, rejoicing in the removal of her reproach of barrenness, when in the sixth the same angel was sent on a similar, but still higher mission, to the city of Nazareth in Galilee. There lived MARY, as she is invariably called in the sacred narrative, without any of those titles of reverence or superstition, by which men, trying to adorn her incomparable dignity, have sown the seeds of Mariolatry. She was still a maiden, but betrothed to JOSEPH, who, like herself, was of the royal house of David.⁷ He was a carpenter by occupation; and the condition of both was lowly, though not that of abject poverty.

For Mary was reserved the lot which had been the object of intense desire to every Hebrew bride, and to every mother of the patriarchal race, since Eve first vainly imagined that it had been fulfilled, "I have gotten a man, even Jehovah"—the promised seed, the Redeemer from sin. Her high destiny was revealed by the angel's salutation, "Hail! thou that art highly favored, the Lord be with thee: blessed art thou among women." As she trembled with astonishment, he proceeded to announce her miraculous visitation by the power of the Holy Ghost, and the birth of a son whose name she was

⁴ Luke i. 11, 19: comp. Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21-23.

⁵ The Hebrew Johanan = Jehoan, the gift of Jehovah. See below, note ²⁰.

⁶ Luke i. 11-17: comp. Mal. iv. 5.

⁷ Notes and Illustrations (A) GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

to call JESUS, who was to be the Son of the Highest and the heir of his father David in a kingdom without end. He confirmed her faith by the example of Elisabeth, who was her relative, though they were of different tribes; and Mary could only reply in those simple words of submissive piety, "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word!"⁸

The "Annunciation" is still celebrated as a Christian festival (March 25th, commonly called Lady Day);⁹ and it has furnished a favorite subject for Christian art. But, beyond this, the words of the angel (v. 28) have been perverted into a ground for worship, and the "Ave Maria" is the daily prayer of myriads. Without staying to expose the grosser excesses of Mariolatry, we may be content to point out an antidote, in our Saviour's own words placing the humblest believer on a level with his mother;¹⁰ words of which the spirit is thus beautifully expressed by one whose reverence draws him to the very verge of something more:—

"Ave Maria! thou whose name
All but adoring love may claim,
Yet may we reach thy shrine;
For He, thy Son and Saviour, vows
To crown all lowly lofty brows
With love and joy like thine.

"Bless'd is the womb that bare Him; bless'd
The bosom where His lips were press'd:
But rather bless'd are they
Who hear his word and keep it well,
The living homes where Christ shall dwell
And never pass away."¹¹

The latest and worst phase of the error has been the attempt to extend to Mary herself the distinction which Christ alone possessed, of being conceived without sin.

Immediately after the Annunciation, Mary hastened to visit her cousin Elisabeth, who was residing with her husband, in one of the Levitical cities among the hills of Judah, probably Hebron, the ancient capital of the priests, or Jut-

⁸ Luke i. 26-38. The exact meaning of *κεχαριτωμένη* in the salutation is, *thou on whom a free gift of grace is bestowed.*

⁹ The opinion which places the birth of Jesus Christ somewhat before the Passover rather than the end of the year, would of course make a

similar difference in the true date of the Annunciation. Respecting the apparent anomaly of placing the birth of our Lord in B.C. 4, see *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

¹⁰ Luke xi. 27, 28.

¹¹ Keble, *Christian Year: The Annunciation.*

tah.¹² The first words she uttered on her entrance seemed to give life to her cousin's unborn child; and, prompted by this sign, Elisabeth saluted Mary as "the mother of the Lord." It was then that Mary, doubtless by immediate inspiration, uttered the first of those three glorious canticles concerning the advent of Christ, which are preserved in the opening chapters of St. Luke, and which have become the chief hymns of the Christian Church, the *Magnificat*,¹³ the *Benedictus*,¹⁴ and the *Nunc Dimittis*.¹⁵ The *Magnificat*, or *Song of Mary*, is based on Hannah's Song of Thanksgiving when she offered Samuel to Jehovah,¹⁶ but it is richly fraught with phrases taken from the whole range of Old Testament Poetry. One term deserves especial notice because of its superstitious abuse: "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed," or rather "count me happy," is an utterance of exuberant joy first used by Leah on the birth of Asher.¹⁷ Mary stayed with Elisabeth three months, till just before the birth of John the Baptist.

§ 4. That event gave rise to the first public intimation of the wonders that were about to dawn on Israel. Elisabeth's relations and friends assembled to congratulate her, and on the eighth day from its birth, the child was brought to the priest for circumcision.¹⁸ On this occasion the new-born child was named, as if to connect it by its personal identity with the privileges and obligations of Jehovah's covenant.¹⁹ The near relatives, who took the lead as Zacharias was still dumb, were giving the child its father's name, when Elisabeth insisted on its being called JOHN, a name sacred by many recollections, especially in the house of Levi,²⁰ and borne by the Maccabæan princes, but strange to the house of Zacharias. The father, appealed to by signs, surprised the company by writing on his tablets, "*His name is JOHN.*" With this act of obedience to the angelic vision, his tongue was loosed, and he praised God. The news spread through all the hills of Judah, not merely exciting wonder, but deep thought and expectation, "What manner of child shall this be?" Signs, connected probably with the early development of the power and temper of the Nazarite, showed that "the

¹² Luke i. 39: comp. Josh. xxi. 9-11. On Juttah, see Josh. xv. 55, xxi. 16. It still bears the name of *Yutta*, and is south of Hebron.

¹³ Luke i. 46-55. ¹⁴ Luke i. 68-79.

¹⁵ Luke ii. 29-32. ¹⁶ 1 Sam. ii. 1-9.

¹⁷ Gen. xxx. 13. For similar uses of

μακαρίζω, see Prov. xxxi. 28, Mal. iii. 12, James v. 11. ¹⁸ Lev. xii. 3.

¹⁹ The like usage in the Christian Church makes the personal name the *christening* and *Christian* name.

²⁰ See JOHANAN and JOHN in the *Dict. of the Bible*.

hand of the Lord was with him." The spirit of prophecy came upon Zacharias; and, in the second of the hymns already mentioned, he blessed God who had at length visited his people with redemption, and raised up for them a prince and Saviour of the house of David, to fulfill his covenant with Abraham; and announced that John was the prophet of God and the herald of this Saviour.

The child's training was in accordance with this destiny. Not only bound by the vow of a Nazarite, but appointed to proclaim repentance to a people sunk in all the sins that spring from self-indulgence, he had to practice the sternest self-denial, but for which perhaps he might have become another Samson:—"The child grew and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing to Israel."²¹ This text compels us to abandon all the fancies of the great painters, whose "Holy Families" exhibit John in familiar intercourse with Jesus, whom he did not know when he came to him for baptism." While Jesus was brought up at Nazareth, John lived in the wild region west of the Dead Sea, with the prophet's garment of camel's hair girded about him,"²² feeding on locusts and wild honey,"²³ and prepared for his mission, like his prototype Elijah, by solitary communion with God.

§ 5. Meanwhile Mary, on her return to Nazareth, had her joy overcast by a great trial. According to Jewish law, the tie of betrothal was as sacred as the marriage vow itself; and Mary's apparent violation of that bond exposed her to the death of an adulteress. But Joseph was no hard man,"²⁴ and he was thinking of giving her a bill of divorcement privately, when an angel revealed to him, in a dream, the holy mystery of Mary's conception, and repeated the injunction already given to her to call the child Jesus, "for he shall save his people from their sins."²⁵ Thus was fulfilled the great proph-

²¹ Luke i. 80.

²² John i. 31.

²³ Matt. iii. 4; Mark i. 6: comp. 2 K. i. 8.

²⁴ Comp. Lev. xi. 22. The strict law of the Nazarite forbade honey; but it was not prohibited to John by the angel, Luke i. 15. See p. 199.

²⁵ The English reader, hesitating about the propriety of the word "*just*" in this connection (Matt. i. 19), is hardly helped by the information that the word translated "*just*" (*δικαιος*) means also *kind*. The truth is that it means *fair*, regardful of that high-

est justice, which is superior to law, and so *considerate* for others. The source of the error is moral; a confusion between true *justice* and the selfish assertion of one's own right. According to this view, Shylock was the most *just* of men, till he was outwitted by one still *juster*.

²⁶ Matt. i. 21. *Jesus* (*Ἰησοῦς*) is the Greek form of the name Joshua or Jeshua, a contraction of Jehoshua, that is, "help of Jehovah" or "Saviour" (Num. xiii. 16). Jesus is the proper name of our Lord: that of

ecy of Isaiah, concerning the birth of *Emmanuel* (*God with us*) from a virgin mother.^{26b} Joseph immediately obeyed the command of the angel to complete the espousal of Mary, but he abstained from consummating the marriage till after the birth of Jesus.²⁷ The subsequent virginity of Mary is simply another of the figments which really add nothing to her dignity or holiness.

§ 6. Though the home of Joseph and Mary was at Nazareth, the sure word of prophecy had declared that the Christ should be born at Bethlehem, the native place of his royal father David;²⁸ and this was accomplished by the agency of the Roman emperor. A decree was issued by Augustus for a census of "all the world" over which his power extended, that is, the Roman Empire and its subject kingdoms. The connection of Judæa with the province of Syria, first established by Pompey, was not regarded as utterly dissolved by Herod's elevation to the throne; nor was the dying prince, for such was Herod's condition at this time, likely to contest the authority under whose shelter his reign had flourished, even though the census might betray the intention of absorbing his kingdom into the empire.²⁹ The sacred pride of the Jews in their genealogies would lead them to hasten to the head cities of their tribes and families. Thus Mary, though about to become a mother, traversed with her husband the length of the land, from Nazareth to Bethlehem,³⁰ the royal city of David, to whose house they both belonged. The caravanserai was crowded with wealthier and more important travelers; so they sought shelter in a stable. Here Mary gave birth to the SAVIOUR of the world, and made his cradle in the manger of the cattle.³¹

But there was no lack of heralds and attendants to welcome Him who said, "Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." No sooner was Jesus born than his *Gospel*—"good tidings of great joy to all the people"—was proclaimed by an angel of Jehovah to certain shepherds, who were keeping their flocks in the fields by night, the fit image of the "great shepherd of the sheep." While he directed

Christ identifies him with the promised *Messiah* (John i. 41), the name given to the long promised Prophet and King whom the Jews had been taught by the prophets to expect. The word *Christ* (Χριστός, from χρίω, "I anoint") signifies, like *Messiah*, "Anointed."

^{26b} Is. vii. 14

²⁷ Matt. i. 18-25.

²⁸ Mic. v. 2.

²⁹ Luke ii. 1, 2. "And this taxing (census) was first made when Cyrenius (Quirinus) was governor of Syria." Respecting the difficulties involved in this passage, see *Notes and Illustrations* (C).

³⁰ On Bethlehem, see *Notes and Illustrations* (D). ³¹ Luke ii. 1-7.

them to Bethlehem, the glory of God shone round them, and a multitude of the heavenly host joined in the chorus,—“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward (or among) men.” Hastening to Bethlehem, the shepherds found the new-born child with his parents, and became the first witnesses to his advent. They praised God, and spread the news abroad, and Mary pondered in her heart the welcome which her babe had received from heaven.”

§ 7. Already acting on the principle afterward proclaimed by Christ,—“it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness,”²²—since he was not only “born of a woman,” but also “born under the law,”²³ his parents brought him to the priest for circumcision at the earliest time appointed by the law, the eighth day from his birth; and he was called Jesus, as the angel had commanded.” But the law had still another claim upon him; and the only begotten son of God was presented to him in the same manner as the other first-born sons of Jewish mothers.” As soon as the forty days allotted for purification after the birth of a son had expired, Mary and Joseph brought Jesus to the Temple at Jerusalem, with the sacrifice appointed for the poorer sort of the people, “a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons,” one for the burnt-offering and the other for the sin-offering,—in place of the full sacrifice of a lamb for the burnt-offering, and a pigeon or turtle-dove for the sin-offering.”

This first appearance of Jesus in the Temple was the signal for his reception by those who may be regarded as the representatives of the spiritual remnant of Israel. An aged man and woman had long watched, with prophetic spirit, for the dawn of the Sun of Righteousness. SIMEON,²⁴ who had been forewarned by the Holy Spirit, that he should not die till he had seen the “Anointed of Jehovah,” was now guided by the same spirit into the Temple; and, taking the child in his arms, he proclaimed him, for the first time, as the CHRIST OF GOD, and declared that, for himself, the time was come

²² Luke ii. 8-20.

²³ Matt. i. 15.

²⁴ Gal. iv. 4.

²⁵ Luke ii. 21; Matt. i. 25. It should be observed that Matthew already gives Jesus his official name of CHRIST.

²⁶ Ex. xiii. 2; Num. viii. 16, 17.

²⁷ Luke ii. 22-24; Lev. xii.

²⁸ This Simeon has been identified by some with the Simeon who succeeded his father Hillel as president

of the Sanhedrim about A.D. 13, and whose son Gamaliel was the Pharisee at whose feet St. Paul was brought up. But this is improbable. Simeon was a common name among the Jews; and it is not likely that St. Luke would have introduced so celebrated a character as the President of the Sanhedrim merely as “a man in Jerusalem.”

to depart in peace, since his eyes had seen the Salvation of God, the Light of the Gentiles, and the Glory of Israel. Thus does his sacred song, in which the Church has ever since united, embody the full doctrine of the personal glory of Christ, the spiritual purpose of his mission, and its universal extent; truths which, when fully learned, prepare the Christian to repeat from the heart his "*Nunc Dimittis*."³⁹ But his prophecy was not ended; for, as Joseph and Mary wondered at his words, he announced the varied reception which Christ would meet from his own people, the trial of the inmost hearts of men by his spirit, and the sorrows which, in striking at him, should smite through his mother's heart,—the primal curse and blessing on the woman.⁴⁰

Simcon had scarcely ceased, when ANNA, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher, entered the sacred court. This devout woman had employed her widowhood of 84 years, after a marriage of only 7, in constant prayers and fasting within the precincts of the Temple. She was a prophetess; and in that character she now gave thanks to God for the advent of the Christ, and repeated her testimony to all that looked for redemption in Jerusalem. It seems to be implied that these "true Israel" were few, and known to one another, a small church among the nation; nor ought we to overlook the part which the express mention of Anna's tribe gives to *Israel*, as well as Judah, in the welcoming of Christ.⁴¹

§ 8. Nor was he without a welcome from the heathen world. "The Gentiles came to his light, and kings to the brightness of his rising."⁴² Tradition and philosophy have had much to say of the "wise men"—properly *MAGIANS*—who were guided by a star from "the East" to Jerusalem, where they suddenly appeared in the days of Herod the Great, inquiring for the new-born king of the Jews, whom they had come to worship.⁴³ That they were three in number, and that they were named Melchior, Caspar, and Balthazar, are statements as little genuine as the skulls which grin out of the gems that deck their shrine at Cologne.⁴⁴ If not "kings," they are proved to be persons of the greatest wealth and distinction by the "treasures" which they opened, to present their gifts to Christ; and the nature of those gifts,

³⁹ Luke ii. 25-32.

⁴⁰ Luke ii. 33-35: comp. 1 Tim. ii. 15.

⁴¹ Luke ii. 36-38.

⁴² Isaiah lx. 8.

⁴³ Matt. ii. 1, 2.

⁴⁴ Their number and names were perhaps fixed to meet the requirements of a "Mystery," or "Miracle Play."

“gold, and frankincense, and myrrh,” implies the homage commonly paid by subject nations to their superior kings and conquerors.⁴⁵ As to the country from which they came, opinions vary greatly; but their following the guidance of a star, and their name of Magians, seem to point to the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates,⁴⁶ where astronomy was early cultivated by the Chaldæans, and where the old Zend religion of Zoroaster had been established by the Persians. That religion, remaining pure from the grosser forms of idolatry, preserved the hope of a great deliverer, who should reform the world and establish a reign of peace. That some tradition, influenced possibly by the Jews of the Dispersion, went so far as to make this deliverer a “King of the Jews,” seems a fair inference from the direct form of their inquiry for him. As to the sign which guided them, the chief difficulties have arisen from the attempt to find a natural explanation; for the plain narrative of St. Matthew evidently represents it as a miracle vouchsafed for the occasion. The ingenious conjecture of certain astronomers, that the appearance of the star was caused by a remarkable conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, is now exploded.⁴⁷ The approach of the two planets was not at all near enough for them to be mistaken for a single star; nor could habitual observers of the heavens fail to recognize the positions of such well-known bodies. Besides, their “standing over the place where the young child was,” so as to define the spot on the surface of the earth, is utterly inconceivable. It only remains for us to be content with the obvious explanation, that some new luminary, whether meteoric or celestial, was made to appear, in a manner distinct enough to the eyes of practiced astronomers, expressly to guide the sages on their way. Ages before, a prophet from the same regions had predicted the Messiah by the sign of “the star that should arise out of Jacob;”⁴⁸ and, while these sages watched the heavens with the reverence of worshipers, it pleased God to use their own ideas as the source of new light, just as Paul declared to the Athenians the “Unknown God,” whom they ignorantly worshiped.

Their arrival and inquiries threw Jerusalem into commotion. With his usual craft, Herod summoned the Sanhedrim,

⁴⁵ Matt. ii. 11: comp. Gen. xliii. 11; Psalm lxii. 15; 1 Kings x. 2, 10; 2 Chr. ix. 24.

⁴⁶ Their character as representatives of the whole heathen world is perhaps the more decidedly marked

by their coming from a country beyond the limits of the Roman empire.

⁴⁷ See *Dict. of the Bible*, art. STAR OF THE WISE MEN.

⁴⁸ The prophecy of Balaam, in Numbers xxiv. 17.

and learned that the Messiah was to be born at Bethlehem.⁴⁹ Having inquired from the Magians the time of the star's appearance, as a guide to that of the child's birth, he professed his desire to worship the new-born king, and sent them on to discover his abode. The star again guided them over the five miles from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, and at length stood still above the house where Jesus was. They paid him their willing homage, and presented their costly gifts, the first fruits of the wealth and wisdom of the Gentile world.

The offerings which they brought have been regarded as symbolical: the gold was tribute to a king, the frankincense was for the use of a priest, and the myrrh was a holy preparing for the tomb; but, in a more general view, these were at any rate the offerings made by worshipers, and in that light must the Magi be regarded. By means of a dream, a form of divination which they were wont to follow with implicit faith, though it is not probable that the reason was revealed to them, they were warned by God not to return to Herod, and they departed into their own country by another route, perhaps by Hebron and round the southern end of the Dead Sea.⁵⁰ Their evasion increased the fears and rage of Herod, who was now racked by the tortures of his last illness.⁵¹ He who had sacrificed wife and sons to the safety of his crown, resolved to make sure of the destruction of the unknown infant by a general massacre of all the male children in Bethlehem and its territory under two years old.⁵²

The angel of God was again sent to Joseph, to direct him to carry Jesus and his mother into Egypt, where they remained in safety while the mothers of Bethlehem realized the mournful picture long before drawn by Jeremiah under the image of Rachel, whose sepulchre was at their gates, weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted, because they were not.⁵³ The abode of Jesus in Egypt formed a step by which the course of his life was assimilated to that of his people's history, and so fulfilled, in its highest sense, the saying of the prophet Hosea, "Out of Egypt have I called my son."⁵⁴ The death of Herod, shortly before the Passover of the same year, was the signal for their return to Palestine, at the command of the angel to Joseph in a dream. But, on en-

⁴⁹ Matt. ii. 3-8: comp. Micah v. 2.

⁵⁰ Matt. ii. 9-12.

⁵¹ See Chap. IV. p. 90.

⁵² The number of victims is commonly misconceived, see Ch. IV. *l. c.* The Church has placed the "Holy

Innocents" among its Protomartyrs. See Wheatley on the *Common Prayer*, c. v. sec. iv. 2.

⁵³ Jer. xxxi. 15: comp. xl. 1.

⁵⁴ Hosea xi. 1.

tering Judæa, they learned that the people had been disappointed of the succession of Herod Antipas, and that the throne was occupied by Archelaus, who was likely to tread in his father's steps.⁵⁵ So they turned aside by the coast road to Galilee, and returned to their own city of Nazareth, whose name, odious to the Jews of Judah, gave Jesus and his disciples their first appellation of NAZARENES, as the prophets had foretold.⁵⁶

Here, in the retirement of his father's lowly abode, we lose sight of Jesus for twelve years. We are only told that "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him."⁵⁷ It is clear from the next event recorded in his history, that these words imply not only a growth in moral and spiritual excellence, but a conscious preparation for his ministry by communion with his divine Father and by diligent study of the Scriptures. His public ministry did not begin with a sudden impulse, but was prepared for by his whole life. The consciousness of his divine nature and power grew and ripened and strengthened until the time of his showing unto Israel. The very silence of the evangelists, however, leads to some important inferences respecting our Saviour's training in boyhood and in youth. As Neander has observed—"His education for a teacher was not due to any of the theological schools then existing in Judæa;" and thus was he the better prepared to stand forth, in perfect independence, as the antagonist and rebuker alike of the dead ritualism and hypocritical casuistry of the Pharisees and Scribes, and the negative coldness of the Sadducees. And while the rigid purity which he taught might suggest something of an outward resemblance to the Essenes, he had no real connection with that ascetic body, to deaden his sympathies with humanity at large. Herein was the contrast with his forerunner, which he himself traces—"John came neither eating nor drinking: the Son of Man came eating and drinking."

§ 9. Ever since the Captivity, the great festivals, like the other institutions of the law, had been observed with regularity, and even the women went up to Jerusalem once a year to keep the Passover. Such was the custom of our Saviour's parents; and when he reached the age of twelve, he accompanied them to the feast. When Joseph and Mary left Jeru

⁵⁵ See Chap. V. § 1, p. 99.

⁵⁶ Matt. ii. 13-23. This is the name still given to Christians in all Mahometan countries. On the posi-

tion of Nazareth, see *Notes and Illustrations* (E).

⁵⁷ Luke ii. 39, 40.

salein, he remained behind, his absence being only discovered after the caravan had gone a day's journey. His sorrowing parents found him in the Temple, the centre of a circle of the professed teachers of the law, astonishing all who heard him, both by his replies to them and by his own questions.⁶⁰ There is nothing here to imply a contentious spirit; but, in the sincere effort to obtain instruction, he could not but show the fruits of his profound study of the Scriptures, and the power of the Spirit that had "filled him with wisdom." This "spiritual discernment," by which he opened the true meaning of God's Word, was the "understanding" which astonished the "natural men," who had long been bound down to the mere letter.

This interview with the Jewish Rabbis is the first of several discussions in which we may trace our Lord's independence of the teaching of the schools. "Had Jesus been trained in the Jewish seminaries, his opponents would doubtless have reproached him with the arrogance of setting up for master where he himself had been a pupil. But, on the contrary, we find that they censured him for attempting to explain the Scriptures without having enjoyed the advantages of the schools."⁶¹ His first appearance as a teacher in the synagogue at Nazareth caused even greater surprise, as he was known there, not as one learned in the law, but rather as a carpenter's son, who had perhaps himself worked at his father's trade. The general impression of his discourses everywhere was, that they contained totally different materials from those furnished by the theological schools."⁶²

His celebrated reply to his mother—"Why did ye seek me? Knew ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" not only reveals his full consciousness of his divine mission, and his zeal to enter upon it at the earliest opportunity; but his use of the word *Father* derives a peculiar significance from the remonstrance of Mary—"Behold thy *father* and I have sought thee sorrowing."⁶³ And yet, though thus conscious of a higher source of his being, and a higher authority for his actions, he again "fulfilled all the righteousness" of filial duty, and proved that he had learned at this early age the hardest of all lessons, to wait God's time when we seem to be not only wasting our own, but losing opportunities of serving him.

⁶⁰ Luke ii. 41-47.

⁶² John vii. 15: "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?"

⁶¹ Matt. vii. 29; Neander's *Life of Christ*, book ii. ch. i.

⁶³ Luke ii. 48-50.

§ 10. The gospel narrative here passes over another interval of eighteen years, from Christ's 12th year to his 30th, with the brief record—"He went down with his parents, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them: but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart. And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."⁶² That he shared all the outward circumstances of Joseph's lowly lot, is clear from the taunt of his fellow-citizens of Nazareth and the neighborhood—"Is not this the carpenter's son?"⁶³ That he worked at his father's bench, may be inferred not only from the circumstances of the case, but also from the laudable custom of the Jews, to bring up their sons in some trade and handicraft.⁶⁴ Joseph appears to have died at some time between the visit of Jesus to the Temple in his twelfth year and his entrance upon his ministry. Mary had a sister also called Mary, the wife of Alphæus or Clopas. Her husband appears likewise to have died before the ministry of our Lord commenced; and the two widowed sisters, with their families, apparently lived together at Nazareth.⁶⁵

That the "Son of the Highest" was born in an humble station, and that the Creator of the world labored as a workman, established from the first his sympathy with all conditions of humanity without distinction of rank and occupation, and marked the beginning of the influence of Christianity on the civil and social relations of mankind. In that lowly condition, too, he would see an abundant measure of the suffering which he came to relieve, and enough of the sin from which all suffering springs, to supply the want of its consciousness in his own sinless nature. For the experience of sin in the world into which he had come was needful to prepare him for the great work of saving his people from their sins.

The later incident of his invitation, with his mother, to the marriage at Cana, as well as the social character of his public life, imply that the whole family lived in cheerful friendly intercourse with the people of their own and the surrounding villages, and that Jesus was no recluse. So much we may gather respecting his outer life. The mysteries of his intellectual, moral, and spiritual progress during that critical pe-

⁶² Luke ii. 51, 52.

⁶³ Matt. xi. 55; Mark vi. 3; Luke iv. 22; John vi. 42.

⁶⁴ In Mark vi. 3, he is himself called "the carpenter." Mr. Herbert's picture conveys a vivid impres-

sion of the daily life of the Holy Family, and the forecast of the Shadow of the Cross.

⁶⁵ See *Notes and Illustrations* to Chap. IX. pp. 281, 282.

riod, in which he passed from boyhood to the full maturity of man, are too deep for human imagination, and can only be seen in the fruit borne in his ministry. But there is the great fact, of the deepest significance for us, that "Jesus *increased* in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." Here is one of those traits of Christ's *perfect humanity*, which have perhaps been too little regarded by those who have had to defend the great doctrine of his true divinity. "It behooved him *in all things* to be made like to his brethren." This truth is obvious in regard to his physical growth; but it is no less true of his mind and soul. Neither did the mysterious union of the Godhead with his human nature exempt him from learning to know the will of God by patient study, and to do it by discipline and self-denial; nor did that complacent regard of the eternal Father for the co-eternal Son, which was especially exhibited on his consent to save mankind—"Lo! I come to do thy will, O God"⁶⁶—preclude that *growth in favor*, with God as well as man, which was the natural reward of his true growth in virtue and in knowledge. The many proofs that this progress still went on during all his life are crowned by the last scene of trial, in which he recognized the possibility of a conflict between the will of God and his self-will as man, and agonized in prayer to achieve the victory, "Father! not MY WILL, but THINE, be done."

Such considerations are most important, not only as giving us a truer view of our Saviour's nature, but as showing that he has the perfect sympathy of experience with our moral, ay, and intellectual conflicts, and that his human virtues, however transcendent in degree, are in kind real examples, which we may imitate by the means he used, because "as he is, so are we in this world."⁶⁷

⁶⁶ Psalm xl. 6; Heb. x. 7, 9.

⁶⁷ 1 John iv. 17.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

THE genealogies of our Lord, as given in St. Matthew and St. Luke, have occasioned much discussion.

It is sufficient to state here that the prophets announced our Lord Jesus Christ as the seed of Abraham and the son of David, and the angel declared that to him should be given the throne of his father David, that

he might reign over the house of Jacob forever. His descent from David and Abraham being therefore an essential part of his Messiahship, it was right that his genealogy should be given as a portion of Gospel truth. Considering, further, that to the Jews first he was manifested and preached, and that his descent from David and Abraham was a matter of special interest to them, it seems likely that the proof of his descent would be one especially adapted to convince them; in other words, that it would be drawn from documents which they deemed authentic. Such were the genealogical records preserved at Jerusalem. And when to the above considerations we add the fact that the lineage of Joseph was actually made out from authentic records for the purpose of the civil census ordered by Augustus, it becomes morally certain that the genealogy of Jesus Christ was extracted from the public registers. Another consideration adds yet further conviction. It has often excited surprise that the genealogies of Christ should both give the descent of Joseph, and not Mary. But if these genealogies were those contained in the public registers, it could not be otherwise. In them Jesus, the son of Mary, the espoused wife of Joseph, could only appear as Joseph's son (comp. John i. 45). In transferring them to the pages of the Gospels, the evangelists only added the qualifying expression "as was supposed" (Luke iii. 23, and its equivalent, Matt. i. 16).

But now to approach the difficulties with which the genealogies of Christ are thought to be beset. These difficulties have seemed so considerable in all ages as to drive commentators to very strange shifts. Some, as early as the second century, broached the notion, which Julius Africanus vigorously repudiates, that the gene-

alogies are imaginary lists, designed only to set forth the union of royal and priestly descent in Christ. Others on the contrary, to silence this and similar solutions, brought in a *Deus ex machinâ*, in the shape of a tradition derived from the Desposyni, in which by an ingenious application of the law of Levirate to two *uterine* brothers, whose mother had married first into the house of Solomon, and afterward into the house of Nathan, some of the discrepancies were reconciled, though the meeting of the two genealogies in Zerubbabel and Salathiel is wholly unaccounted for. Later, and chiefly among Protestant divines, the theory was invented of one genealogy being Joseph's and the other Mary's, a theory in direct contradiction to the plain letter of the Scripture narrative, and leaving untouched as many difficulties as it solves. The fertile invention of Annius of Viterbo forged a book in Philo's name, which accounted for the discrepancies by asserting that all Christ's ancestors, from David downward, had two names. The circumstance, however, of one line running up to Solomon, and the other to Nathan, was overlooked. Other fanciful suggestions have been offered; while infidels, from Porphyry downward, have seen in what they call the contradiction of Matthew and Luke a proof of the spuriousness of the Gospels; and critics, like Professor Norton, a proof of such portions of Scripture being interpolated. Others, like Alford, content themselves with saying that solution is impossible, without further knowledge than we possess. But it is not too much to say that after all, in regard to the main points, there is no difficulty at all, if only the documents in question are dealt with reasonably, and after the analogy of similar Jewish documents in the O. T.; and that the clues to a right

understanding of them are so patent, and so strongly marked, that it is surprising that so much diversity of opinion should have existed. The following propositions will explain the true construction of these genealogies:

1. They are both the genealogies of Joseph, *i. e.*, of Jesus Christ, as the reputed and legal son of Joseph and Mary. One has only to read them to be satisfied of this. The notices of Joseph as being of the house of David, by the same evangelists who give the pedigree, are an additional confirmation (Matt. i. 20; Luke i. 27, ii. 4, etc.); and since there can be little doubt that these pedigrees were extracted from the public archives, they must have been Joseph's.

2. The genealogy of St. Matthew is Joseph's genealogy as legal successor to the throne of David, *i. e.*, it exhibits the successive heirs of the kingdom ending with Christ, as Joseph's reputed son. St. Luke's is Joseph's private genealogy, exhibiting his real birth, as David's son, and thus showing why he was heir to Solomon's crown. The simple principle that one evangelist exhibits that genealogy which contained the successive heirs to David's and Solomon's throne, while the other exhibits the paternal stem of him who was the heir, explains all the anomalies of the two pedigrees, their agreements as well as their discrepancies, and the circumstance of there being two at all.

3. Mary, the mother of Jesus, was in all probability the daughter of Jacob, and first cousin to Joseph her husband. So that in point of *fact*, though not of *form*, both the genealogies are as much hers as her husband's.

Respecting the minor difficulties in the genealogies, the student is referred to the *Dict. of the Bible*, art. **GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.**

(B.) DATE OF THE BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST.

ACCORDING to the received chronology, which is in fact that of Dionysius Exiguus in the 6th century, our Lord was born in the year of Rome 754, which is therefore called A.D. 1. But modern writers, with hardly an exception, believe that this calculation places the Nativity some years too late; although they differ as to the amount of error. Herod the Great died, according to Josephus, in the thirty-seventh year after he was appointed king (*Ant.* xvii. 8, § 1, *B. J.* i. 83, § 8). His elevation coincides with the consulship of Cn. Domitius Calvinus and C. Asinius Pollio, and this determines the date A.U.C. 714 = B.C. 40 (*Joseph. Ant.* xiv. 14, § 5). There is reason to think that in such calculations Josephus reckons the years from the month Nisan to Nisan; and also that the death of Herod took place in the beginning of the thirty-seventh year, or just before the Passover (*Joseph. Ant.* xvii. 9, § 3); if then thirty-six complete years are added, they give the year of Herod's death A.U.C. 750 = B.C. 4. As Jesus was born during the life of Herod, it follows from these data that the Nativity took place some time before the month of April, 750; and if it took place only a few months before Herod's death, then its date would be four years earlier than the Dionysian reckoning. We have no precise data for determining the interval between the birth of Jesus and the death of Herod; but there are some reasons for supposing it to have been briefer than the space between "Christmas" and "Easter." The *epoch* of the Christian era, however, is independent of this nice calculation, being the *zero point* between Dec. 31 and Jan. 1 nearest the actual event, *i. e.*, the beginning of B.C. 4.—Mr. Lewin, how-

ever, places the birth of our Lord in B.C. 6, about August 1. See note on p. 358.

(C.) CYRENIUS AND THE CENSUS.

CYRENIUS (*Κυρήνιος*) is a Greek form of the Roman name QUIRINUS, whose full name is Publius Sulpicius Quirinus. He was consul B.C. 12, and made governor of Syria after the banishment of Archelaus in A.D. 7 (Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 13, § 5). He was sent to make an enrolment of property in Syria, and made accordingly, both there and in Judæa, a census or ἀπογραφή (Joseph *l.c.*, and xviii. 1, § 1). But this census seems in Luke (ii. 2) to be identified with one which took place at the time of the birth of Christ, when Sentius Saturninus is said to have been governor of Syria. Hence has risen a considerable difficulty, which has been variously solved, either by supposing some corruption in the text of St. Luke (a supposition which is not countenanced by any external critical evidence), or by giving some unusual sense to his words, αὐτῇ ἡ ἀπογραφή πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρήνιου. But Prof. A. W. Zumpt, of Berlin, has assigned good reasons for believing that Quirinus was *twice* governor of Syria, and that the first census was made in his first governorship, which dates from B.C. 4 to B.C. 1, when he was succeeded by M. Lollius.

(D.) BETHLEHEM.

BETH-LEHEM (*i. e.* house of bread), is one of the oldest towns in Palestine. Its earliest name was EPHRATH or EPHRATAH (see Gen. xxxv. 16, xlviii. 7; Josh. xv. 59, LXX.), and it is not till long after the occupation of the country by the Israelites that we meet with it under

its new name of Bethlehem. The ancient name still lingered as a familiar word in the mouths of the inhabitants of the place (Ruth i. 2, iv. 11; 1 Sam. xvii. 12), and in the poetry of the Psalmists and Prophets (Ps. cxxxii. 6; Mic. v. 2) to a late period. After the conquest, Bethlehem appears under its own name Bethlehem-judah (Judg. xvii. 7; 1 Sam. xvii. 12; Ruth i. 1, 2), possibly to distinguish it from the small and remote place of the same name in Zebulun. Bethlehem, although the birthplace of David and our Lord, remained in obscurity throughout the whole of the Sacred history. After its mention in the N. T. we hear nothing more of Bethlehem till near the middle of the 2d century, when Justin Martyr speaks of our Lord's birth as having taken place "in a certain cave very close to the village," which cave he goes on to say had been specially pointed out by Isaiah as "a sign." The passage from Isaiah to which he refers is xxxiii 13-19, in the LXX. version of which occurs the following—"He shall dwell on high: His place of defense shall be in a lofty cave of the strong rock" (Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* §§ 78, 70). While it is not possible to say with certainty that the tradition is true, there is no reason for discrediting it. There is nothing in itself improbable in the supposition that the place in which Joseph and Mary took shelter, and where was the "manger" or "stall" (whatever the φάτνη may have been), was a cave in the limestone rock of which the eminence of Bethlehem is composed. But the step from the belief that the nativity may have taken place in a cavern, to the belief that the present subterraneous vault or crypt is that cavern, is a very wide one. The present church was built by Constantine about A.D. 330.

The modern town of *Beit-lahm*

lies to the E. of the main road from Jerusalem to Hebron, 6 miles from the former. It covers the E. and N.E. parts of the ridge of a "long gray hill" of Jura limestone, which is about a mile in length.

(E.) NAZARETH.

NAZARETH is not mentioned in the Old Testament or in Josephus, but occurs first in Matt. ii. 23, though a town could hardly fail to have existed on so eligible a spot from much earlier times. It is situated among the hills which constitute the south ridges of Lebanon, just before they sink down into the Plain of Esdraelon. Among those hills is a valley which runs in a waving line nearly east and west, about a mile long and, on the average, a quarter of a mile broad, but which at a certain point enlarges itself considerably so as to form a sort of basin. In this basin or enclosure, along the lower edge of the hill-side, lies the quiet secluded village in which the Saviour of men spent the greater part of his earthly existence. Being so sheltered by hills, Nazareth enjoys a mild atmosphere and climate. Hence all the fruits of the country—as pomegranates, oranges, figs, olives—ripen early and attain a rare perfection. Of the identification of the ancient site there can be no doubt. The name of the present village is *en-Nâzirah*, the same, therefore, as of old; it is formed on a hill or mountain (Luke iv. 29); it is within the limits of the province of Galilee (Mark i. 9); it is near Cana (whether we assume *Kana* on the east or *Kana* on the north-east as the scene of the first miracle), according to the implication in John ii. 1, 2, 11; a precipice exists in the neighborhood (Luke iv. 29); and, finally, a series of testimonies reach back to Eusebius, the father of

Church history, which represent the place as having occupied an invariable position.


The origin of the disrepute in which Nazareth stood (John i. 47) is not certainly known. All the inhabitants of Galilee were looked upon with contempt by the people of Judæa because they spoke a ruder dialect, were less cultivated, and were more exposed by their position to contact with the heathen. But Nazareth labored under a special opprobrium, for it was a Galilean and not a southern Jew who asked the reproachful question, whether "any good thing" could come from that source. The term "good" (*ἀγαθόν*), having more commonly an ethical sense, it has been suggested that the inhabitants of Nazareth may have had a bad name among their neighbors for irreligion or some laxity of morals. The supposition receives support from the disposition which they manifested toward the person and ministry of our Lord. They attempted to kill him; they expelled him twice (if Luke iv. 16-29, and Matt. xiii. 54-58, relate probably to different occurrences) from their borders; they were so willful and unbelieving that he performed not many miracles among them (Matt. xiii. 58); and, finally, they compelled him to turn his back upon them and reside at Capernaum (Matt. iv. 13).

Among the "holy places" which the legends have sought to connect with events in the life of Christ, two localities are of special interest. One of these is the "Fountain of the Virgin," situated at the north-eastern extremity of the town, where, according to one tradition, the mother of Jesus received the angel's salutation (Luke i. 28). Though we may attach no importance to this latter belief, we must, on other accounts, regard the spring with a feeling akin to that of religious veneration.

tion. It derives its name from the fact that Mary, during her life at Nazareth, no doubt accompanied often by "the child Jesus," must have been accustomed to repair to this fountain for water, as is the practice of the women of that village at the present day. It presents a busy scene, from the number of those, hurrying to and fro, engaged in the labor of water-carrying.

The other place is that of the attempted Precipitation. We are directed to the true scene of this occurrence, not so much by any tradi-

tion as by internal indications in the Gospel history itself. A prevalent opinion of the country has transferred the event to a hill about two miles south-east of the town. Above the town are several rocky ledges over which a person could not be thrown without almost certain destruction. But there is one very remarkable precipice, almost perpendicular and forty or fifty feet high, near the Maronite church, which may well be supposed to be the identical one over which his infuriated townsmen attempted to hurl Jesus.



Nazareth.

CHAPTER VII.

OUR SAVIOUR'S EARLY MINISTRY, FROM THE PREACHING OF JOHN THE BAPTIST TO CHRIST'S FIRST PASSOVER. A.D. 26-27.

§ 1. State of Judæa at the appearance of JOHN THE BAPTIST. § 2. His preaching of repentance, and his Baptism. His addresses to different classes. The Pharisees reject, the common people and Publicans believe him. § 3. The Baptism of Jesus; its significance. The descent of the Holy Ghost. Jesus proclaimed the Son of God. § 4. The temptation of Jesus: its meaning, scene, and incidents: parallel to Moses and Elijah in the desert. The ministry of angels. § 5. John disclaims the Messiahship for himself, and proclaims Jesus as the Lamb of God. § 6. Two of John's disciples follow Christ—Andrew, and probably John. Andrew brings his brother Simon. Beginning of the Christian Church. Call of Philip and Nathanael, or Bartholomew. Their successive confessions of the Christ. § 7. Goes with his disciples into Galilee. The Marriage Feast at Cana. Jesus and Mary. Our Lord's First Miracle. Essential character of miracles. Already familiar to the Jews. Tests laid down by the Rabbis: satisfied in the miracle at Cana. Its effect on the disciples. Social aspect of the miracle. Sanction of the ordinance of marriage, though himself unmarried. § 8. Christ's short abode at Capernaum. Conclusion of the more private opening of his ministry. Approach of the Passover.

§ 1. THE preceding narrative has left both Jesus and his appointed forerunner awaiting "the time of their showing to

Israel," the former in the circle of his family, the latter leading a wild, ascetic life in the wilderness about Engedi. Meanwhile, the state of the Holy Land was enough to show that "the fullness of time was come" for the appearance of the preacher of repentance as the herald of the kingdom of heaven. "The sceptre had departed from Judah" at the deposition of Archelaus, the son of Herod (A.D. 7); and Judæa was governed by a Roman procurator under the prefect of Syria.¹ The degradation of seeing a heathen power on the ruins of the throne of David was embittered by the oppression of the *publicans* (*portitores*), generally Jews—collectors who exacted far more than they had to pay over to the farmers of the revenue.² The people were ripe for rebellion; and a sect arose, under Judas, the Gaulonite, denying the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar.

Such was the state of things in Judæa when JOHN THE BAPTIST appeared in public, at the epoch which St. Luke carefully marks by a concurrence of chronological data.³ It was in the 15th year of Tiberius, A.D. 26 (reckoning from his association with Augustus in the empire in A.D. 12), when Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judæa, Herod Antipas tetrarch of Galilee, Philip tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis, and Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene. Annas and Caiaphas are both named as high-priests; in fact, Annas was deposed by Valerius Gratus in A.D. 14, and was succeeded after a time by his son-in-law, Caiaphas or Joseph. In the subsequent narrative we find both acting together, with a sort of joint authority, as heads of the Jewish people. The frequent changes in the high-priesthood at this time formed an irritating feature of the Roman policy.

§ 2. At this time of general commotion and expectation, the prophetic word of God came to John in the wilderness of Judæa, and he came forward as a preacher. Though he laid no claim to miraculous powers,⁴ there was every thing about him to excite attention. A rare, and probably solitary specimen of the ancient Nazarites, like Samson and Samuel, commanding admiration by his life of ascetic retirement, he had assumed also the prophet's mantle of camel's hair, fastened to the body by a girdle, a dress which of itself recalled the person of Elijah.⁵ Being, in fact, the greatest, as he was the last

¹ See p. 106.

² Luke iii. 13. See *Notes and Illustrations* (A), THE PUBLICANS.

³ Luke iii. 1, 2.

⁴ John x. 41.

⁵ 2 Kings i. 8; comp. Zech. xiii. 4.

His food was locusts and wild honey. There are people at this day who gravely assert that the locusts which formed part of the food of the Baptist were not the insects of that name,

prophet, nay, the greatest man of the Old Covenant, he merged all claims to personal dignity in his one office as the forerunner of Messiah, foretold by the prophet Isaiah. He almost sinks his personality in his character of a herald:—"I am the *voice* of one crying in the wilderness, 'Make straight the way of the Lord,' as saith the prophet Esaias." So intimate was the relation of John's mission to the advent of the Christ, that St. Mark pronounces John's preaching in the wilderness as predicted by the prophets, "the *beginning* of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God."⁶

To this character all his preaching was perfectly adapted. The prophet Malachi had long since described the work that must be done in the hearts of men before they could receive the coming Saviour; and now that John proclaimed "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," he preached "repentance for the remission of sins," as the condition not only of entrance into that kingdom, but of exemption from utter destruction from the presence of the great One who was coming. He showed that aspect of the Gospel, on which Christ also insisted, that, together with the proffer of mercy, it involves a final decision, according as that mercy is accepted or refused.⁷

The outward sign which marked those who became his disciples, the rite from which he obtained his characteristic name, the *Baptist*, taught most impressively the putting away the evils by which the whole life of the people was corrupted. It is an old controversy whether the baptism of John was a new institution, or an imitation of the baptism of proselytes as practiced by the Jews.⁸ But at all events there is no record of such a rite, conducted in the name of, and

but the long sweet pods of the locust-tree, "St. John's bread," as the monks of Palestine call it. But locusts are still used for food in the East. There are different ways of preparing them for food. Sometimes they are ground and pounded, and then mixed with flour and water and made into cakes, or they are salted and then eaten; sometimes smoked; boiled or roasted; stewed, or fried in butter. Dr. Kitto, who tasted locusts, says they are more like shrimps than any thing else; and an English clergyman, some years ago, cooked some of the green grasshoppers, *Locusta viridissima*, boiling them in wa-

ter half an hour, throwing away the head, wings, and legs, and then sprinkling them with pepper and salt, and adding butter; he found them excellent. How strange then, nay, "how idle," to quote the words of Kirby and Spence (*Entom.* i. 305), "was the controversy concerning the locusts which formed part of the sustenance of John the Baptist, . . . and how apt even learned men are to perplex a plain question from ignorance of the customs of other countries."

⁶ Mark i. 1-4.

⁷ Matt. iii. 10; Luke iii. 9.

⁸ On the baptism of proselytes, see p. 150.

with reference to a particular person, before the ministry of John.

Each class among the multitudes who flocked from Jerusalem and all Judæa to hear him, and receive his baptism, was taught the lesson of repentance in the form they most required:—the *publicans* to practice honesty and moderation; the *soldiers* to abstain from violence, false accusations, and wrongful exactions from a subject people; the *selfish* to share their abundance with the poor; while the rival sects of the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees*, who claimed the exclusive privileges of the covenant with Abraham, were sternly denounced as a “generation of vipers,” warned that God could raise up true children to Abraham from the very stones of the desert, and summoned to prove their repentance by some good fruits before the sentence already uttered was executed, to cut them down as barren trees, fit only to be cast into the fire.⁹ All that he said and did inflamed the expectation, to which his only answer was by proclaiming the coming of his far greater successor.

These exhortations produced little effect on the two leading sects. Of the Pharisees and teachers of the law we are distinctly told that “they frustrated the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.” It was otherwise with the mass of the people, and especially with the publicans.¹⁰ By accepting the baptism of John, they gave, at the very beginning of the Gospel dispensation, an illustration of the great principle so often taught by Christ, that the sinner, conscious of his guilt, is better prepared to enter the kingdom of heaven by repentance, than self-righteous men who think they need no repentance. The career of John seems to have been very brief; and it has been asked how such great influence could have been attained in a short time.¹¹ But his was a powerful nature, which soon took possession of those who came within its reach; and his success becomes less surprising if we assume, with some commentators, that the preaching took place in a Sabbatical year. Speaking generally, John had baptized “all the people,” and so had “made ready a people prepared for the Lord,” when the time came for him to crown his ministry by the baptism of Jesus himself. The time that had elapsed from the commencement of his ministry to this event may be safely reck-

⁹ Matt. iii. 7-10; Luke iii. 7-9. Our version hardly gives the full force of the present imperfect of the original, “is on the point of being cut down.”

¹⁰ Luke vii. 29, 30. This passage explains the extent of the phrase “all the people,” in Luke iii. 21

¹¹ Matt. iii. 5.

oned at six months, namely, the difference between the ages of John and Jesus, assuming that the former, like the latter, began his ministry at the regular Levitical age of thirty.¹² During this period, his predictions of the Messiah grew more and more frequent: the "herald" became more distinctly the "evangelist."¹³

§ 3. At length Jesus, being about the age of thirty, came forth from his retirement at Nazareth and traveled to the Jordan, where John was then baptizing, to submit himself to the initiatory rite.¹⁴ There is something, at first sight, almost unaccountable in this step. That he who "knew no sin" should thus seem to "arise and wash away his sins;" that he who truly "needed no repentance" and was himself the spiritual King, should accept at the hands of the preacher of repentance the rite of initiation into his own kingdom! And so it seemed to John, who at first opposed his wish, exclaiming, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" The answer solves the mystery:—"Suffer it now,"—in this present dispensation of my humiliation—"for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." He had come in the "likeness of sinful flesh," though it was a *likeness* only. "He was *made sin* for us," though in himself he "knew no sin." And he felt it to be as much his part to "condemn sin in the flesh," by renouncing it through the water of baptism, as by expiating it by his blood upon the cross; and so he set the example of entrance into his kingdom by the path of meek repentance, and of solemn obligation to a holy life. His conscience, free from all sense of guilt, must have felt it

¹² Luke iii. 23: comp. Numb. iv. 3, 35, 39, 43, 47. The assumption is all the safer, as John was of the tribe of Levi and the house of Aaron.

Connecting the view, that our Lord was born very shortly before Herod's death, that is before the Passover of B.C. 4, with the fact that his public ministry commenced at a Passover (John ii. 13), it seems a necessary inference that the baptism and temptation of Jesus, with the call of his first disciples, and the miracle at Cana in Galilee (John ii. 1), took place, in part at least, before the completion of his thirtieth year, in A.D. 27. With this agrees St. Luke's notice, inserted *after* the account of his baptism, that "Jesus himself began to

be about thirty years of age" (Luke iii. 23). As the temptation occupied forty days of the interval, the whole of it may be reckoned at about two or three months, which would place our Lord's baptism about the beginning of A.D. 27. His whole public ministry extends over the period of three full years, from the *first Passover*, at which he appeared in the Temple (A.D. 27), to the *fourth Passover*, at which he was crucified (A.D. 30).

¹³ Comp. the κηρύσσω of Matt. iii. 1, with the πολλά εὐηγγελίζετο of Luke iii. 18.

¹⁴ Matt. iii. 13; Mark i. 9; Luke iii. 21.

hard to descend into the water; but this first suffering had its reward in the glory that at once followed. This first act of submission to his Father's will called forth the first public tokens of his Father's acceptance of the sacrifice, and approving love toward himself. As he stepped past the water's edge, he knelt down to pray, devoting his whole being to the work to which he had been consecrated by his baptism. At that moment a double sign was vouchsafed from heaven to the eyes and ears of the multitude, among whom Jesus had hitherto appeared as one of themselves. The sky was seen to open, and the Spirit of God descended upon him in a bodily shape, like a dove, and a voice was heard from heaven, saying, "Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The former act was another baptism, which exceeded the commission of John, endowing Jesus with the power of God, and given to him to be conferred in turn upon his disciples; while the voice was that direct attestation from God himself, which the Jewish teachers recognized by the name of the *Bath-Col* (daughter of the voice), and which was twice again repeated in the course of his ministry.^{14b}

§ 4. Though he had thus fulfilled the main object of his ministry, which was "that Christ should be made manifest to Israel," John still continued the work of preparing the people to receive him. Meanwhile Jesus was withdrawn again from the thousands of eyes that were watching what would follow, to undergo that trial which was to fit him to sympathize with his tempted brethren. "Though he were a Son," as he had just been proclaimed from heaven, "yet learned he obedience by the things that he suffered; and being thus made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him."¹⁵ It was immediately after his baptism, by the very first impulse of the Spirit which had then descended on him, that Jesus was driven into the wilderness, to undergo in solitude not only the great moral trial of his humanity, but the second great trial of human nature itself. The forty days spent by our Saviour in the wilderness bear a striking resemblance to the forty days' retirement of Moses on Mount Sinai, and the forty days spent by Elijah at Horeb; and this likeness between the Mediator of the New Covenant and the Mediator and Reformer of the Old becomes the more significant from the subsequent appearance of Moses and Elijah with Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration. The paral

^{14b} On the place of our Lord's Baptism, see *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

¹⁵ Heb. v. 8, 9.

lel must not, however, be pressed to the inference that our Saviour was led so far as the peninsula of Sinai: the scene of his temptation was probably in the wilderness of Judæa, the wild beasts of which are mentioned by St. Mark.¹⁶

It is impossible for us to form a complete conception of our Lord's temptation, since temptation with us is always associated with the possibility of sin, whereas Christ's trial was that of one who could not possibly have fallen. But while we must be content with an incomplete conception, we must avoid the wrong conceptions that are often substituted for it. Some suppose the account before us to describe what takes place in a vision or ecstasy of our Lord; so that both the temptation and its answer arise from within. Others think that the temptation was suggested from within, but in a state, not of sleep or ecstasy, but of complete consciousness. Others consider this narrative to have been a parable of our Lord, of which he has made himself the subject. All these suppositions set aside the historical testimony of the Gospels: the temptation, as there described, arose not from the sinless mind of the Son of God, where, indeed, thoughts of evil could not have harbored, but from Satan, the enemy of the human race. Nor can it be supposed that this account is a mere parable, unless we assume that Matthew and Luke have wholly misunderstood their Master's meaning. The story is that of a fact, hard indeed to be understood, but not to be made easier by explanations such as would invalidate the only testimony on which it rests.

The three temptations are addressed to the three forms in which the disease of sin makes its appearance on the soul—to the solace of sense, and the love of praise, and the desire of gain.¹⁶ But there is one element common to them all—they are attempts to call up a willful and wayward spirit in contrast to a patient self-denying one.

In the first temptation the Redeemer is an-hungered, and when the devil bids him, if he be the Son of God, command that the stones may be made bread, there would seem to be no great sin in this use of divine power to overcome the pressing human want. Our Lord's answer is required to show us where the essence of the temptation lay. He takes the words

¹⁶ Tradition places the scene of our Lord's temptation on one of the mountains opposite Jericho, called *Quaranta* or *Quarantania*, from the forty days' fast. "The mountain rises precipitously, an almost perpendicular wall of rock, twelve or fifteen hundred feet above the plain, crowned with a chapel on its highest summit." But the tradition appears not to be older than the age of the crusades. Robinson, i. p. 567. ¹⁶ 1 John ii. 16

of Moses to the children of Israel," which mean, not that men must dispense with bread, and feed only on the study of the divine word, but that our meat and drink, our food and raiment, are all the work of the creating hand of God; and that a sense of *dependence on God* is the duty of man. He tells the tempter that as the sons of Israel, standing in the wilderness, were forced to humble themselves and to wait upon the hand of God for the bread from heaven which he gave them, so the Son of Man, fainting in the wilderness from hunger, will be humble, and will wait upon his Father in heaven for the word that shall bring him food, and will not be hasty to deliver himself from that dependent state, but will wait patiently for the gifts of his goodness.

In the second temptation, it is not probable that they left the wilderness, but that Satan was allowed to suggest to our Lord's mind the place and the marvel that could be wrought there. They stood, as has been suggested, on the lofty porch that overhung the valley of Kedron, where the steep side of the valley was added to the height of the Temple,¹⁸ and made a depth that the eye could scarcely have borne to look down upon. "Cast thyself down"—perform in the Holy City, in a public place, a wonder that will at once make all men confess that none but the Son of God could perform it. A passage from the 91st Psalm is quoted to give a color to the argument. Our Lord replies by an allusion to another text, that carries us back again to the Israelites wandering in the wilderness: "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah."¹⁹ Their conduct is more fully described by the Psalmist as a tempting of God: "They tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust; yea, they spake against God: they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness? Behold he smote the rock that the waters gushed out, and the streams overflowed. Can he give bread also? Can he provide flesh for his people?"²⁰ Just parallel was the temptation here. God has protected thee so far, brought thee up, put his seal upon thee by manifest proofs of his favor. Can he do this also? Can he send the angels to buoy thee up in thy descent? Can he make the air thick to sustain, and the earth soft to receive thee? The appropriate answer is, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

In the third temptation it is not asserted that there is any mountain from which the eyes of common men can see the

¹⁷ Dent. viii. 3.¹⁸ Joseph. *Ant.* xv. 11, § 5.¹⁹ Dent. vi. 16.²⁰ Ps. lxxviii. 19, 20.

world and its kingdoms at once displayed; it was with the mental vision of One who knew all things that these kingdoms and their glory were seen. And Satan has now begun to discover, if he knew not from the beginning, that One is here who can become the King over them all. He says, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." In St. Luke the words are fuller: "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them, for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it:" but these words are the lie of the tempter, which he uses to mislead. "Thou art come to be great—to be a king on the earth; but I am strong, and will resist thee. Thy followers shall be imprisoned and slain; some of them shall fall away through fear; others shall forsake thy cause, loving this present world. Cast in thy lot with me; let thy kingdom be an earthly kingdom, only the greatest of all—a kingdom such as the Jews seek to see established on the throne of David. Worship me by living as the children of this world live, and so honoring me in thy life: then all shall be thine." The Lord knows that the tempter is right in foretelling such trials to him; but, though clouds and darkness hang over the path of his ministry, he must work the work of Him that sent him, and not another work: he must worship God and none other. "Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." As regards the order of the temptations, there are internal marks that the account of St. Matthew assigns them their historical order: St. Luke transposes the two last, for which various reasons are suggested by commentators.²¹

The ministry of angels to Jesus, at the close of the temptation, is the first example (unless we include the cases before his birth) of a feature in his career on which the Apostle Paul lays stress, and in which we see his command of the world of spirits—a command which he has ever used on behalf of his tempted people, sending forth his "spirit-servants" to minister to the heirs of salvation. Nor should we omit to notice that Satan departed from him only "for a season." The great decisive battle of obedience to God and resistance to sin had been gained; but the enemy would not confess a final defeat. This was pre-eminently *the temptation*; but our Lord himself described his course as a scene of *continued temptation*;²²

²¹ Matt. iv. 1-11; Mark i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1-13. The preceding account of the temptation is taken from Archbishop Thomson's art. JESUS CHRIST, in the *Dictionary of the Bible*.
²² Luke xxii. 28.

and he had yet to secure the victory by that last agony in which "the prince of the world came, but still found nothing in him." And so with his people, "they that endure *to the end shall be saved.*"

§ 5. It would seem that the baptism of Jesus, and his mysterious disappearance, had brought the alarm of the rulers at Jerusalem to a climax; and they sent priests and Levites to require John to tell them plainly who he was. They appear to have been perplexed between his mission and that of the coming "greater one," who had been just shown and then withdrawn. To the successive inquiries—"Art thou the Christ?" "Art thou Elias?" "Art thou that prophet?"—one greater even than Elias, whom the Jews expected to be raised again from the dead as the forerunner of the Messiah—he gave a direct negative, again repeating the description of his work in the words of Isaiah.

At length there came a day, when he was able to reply to their challenge of his right to baptize at all, if he had none of these claims, by telling them of *ONE then standing among them*, though they knew him not, as whose forerunner he himself baptized with water unto repentance. For Jesus had now returned from the scene of his temptation; and, on the following day, John seized an opportunity to point him out in those memorable words, which describe him as the substance of the types of the law, and the one true sacrifice for the salvation of all the world—"Behold! the *LAMB OF GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world!*" This, he added, was the *SON OF GOD*, who had been marked by the descent of the Spirit, who should confer on them the higher baptism of the Holy Ghost, and whose revelation to Israel was the one object of his own ministry." This open proclamation of the Christ had no immediate and visible result. The astonished people probably went away to meditate on all these wonders, while the process of conversion to Christ began, in God's own quiet course, with a few individuals, who had been prepared to come to him by John's teaching.

§ 6. It was on the following day that John, surprised perhaps that his words of yesterday had led to no greater result, repeated them in a more private way to two of his disciples, as they saw Jesus walking by them. It was soon after the hour of the evening sacrifice, that they heard him say, for the second time, "Behold the Lamb of God;" and this time the words came to them with the power of the Spirit. They fol-

lowed Jesus, and became the two first of his disciples. And here we have the record of the very first of "those gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth" in the character of the Teacher and Saviour of his people. Turning round, and seeing them following, not daring to overtake and address him, he said, "What seek ye?" His first words were an unbounded encouragement to prayer. Their effect shows that they were uttered with that mingled kindness and authority which could proceed from no other lips; for, at once addressing him by the title of a Jewish teacher, they asked to be admitted to his private converse: "Rabbi! (Master) where dwellest thou?" He invited them to his abode, and they spent the rest of the day in hearing words which convinced them that he was the Messiah, and which led one of them, **ANDREW**, to seek his own brother **SIMON** that same evening, and bring him to Jesus. Simon was received with a salutation which proved that Jesus already knew him, and with a new surname, at once descriptive of his character, and symbolical of the truth, that Christ is the rock on which his Church is founded. This name was, in the vernacular, **CEPHAS**, answering to the Greek **PETER**, and signifying a stone or rock. That the other of the two first disciples of our Lord was **JOHN**, can scarcely admit of question. The modest reserve, which keeps back his own name, is consistent with his usual manner of naming himself as "that other disciple," "the disciple whom Jesus loved." The naming of the other earliest disciples, but not of John, combined with the internal evidence of his presence at the scenes related in the first few chapters of his Gospel, puts the matter beyond a question. This early introduction to our Saviour places him at once in that position of a constant and close companion, which gives so remarkable a character to his Gospel. Nor can we refrain from imagining how, while Andrew had no sooner heard enough from Jesus to work conviction in his mind, he hastened to seek his brother with the news, "We have found the Messiah!"—John remained sitting at the Saviour's feet, and drinking in the first mysteries of his kingdom. Thus was that kingdom inaugurated upon earth, by the secret converse of Jesus with three fishermen, who had come to be baptized by John, in some rude hut reared on the banks of Jordan; but those three already formed the **CHRISTIAN CHURCH**.²⁴

It is very characteristic of the gradual course of Christ's revelation, that he withdrew on the next day, from the crowds

²⁴ John i. 35-42.

assembled about John, to Galilee. But first he called another disciple, PHILIP, a man of Bethsaida, the native place of Andrew and Peter.²⁶ Philip, like Andrew, sought to share the blessing with a friend. This was NATHANAEL, of Cana in Galilee, the same who is afterward called Bartholomew,²⁷ whose zeal for the purity of Judaism, unlike that of the mere formalists, was adorned by deep and sincere devotion. His celebrated objection—"Can any good come out of Nazareth?"—betrayed the prejudice even of a Galilean against the despised village of Christ; but all such feelings vanished at once, when Jesus not only accosted him as "an Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile," but assured Nathanael that he had seen him in his wonted place of secret prayer, under the shade of a fig-tree, where no human eye could see him. This proof of Christ's omniscience called forth a confession which forms a climax to those made by the other disciples. Andrew and his companion had acknowledged him as their *Master*, and the former had told Peter that they had found the *Christ*; Philip had recognized in *Jesus of Nazareth* the *son of Joseph*, him who had been foretold by *Moses and the prophets*; and now Nathanael gives him the full titles of the Messiah: "Rabbi! Thou art the *Son of God!* Thou art the *King of Israel!*" His faith was rewarded by the promise of higher exhibitions of Christ's glory in the ministry of the angels from heaven.²⁷

§ 7. The next day but one after the calling of Nathanael, a marriage-feast was held at Cana.²⁸ There appears to have been a twofold reason for our Saviour's presence. His mother was one of the guests; and it seems probable that Mary had gone from Nazareth, while Jesus went direct to Cana, at the invitation of Nathanael, who was a native of that place,

²⁶ The exact position of Beth-saida (= "house of fish") is uncertain. It was on the west side of the lake, in the near neighborhood of Capernaum and Chorazin. (See p. 214, note 83). It must be distinguished from a second Bethsaida on the east side of the lake, where the 5000 were fed. See *Dict. of Bible*, art. BETHSAIDA.

²⁷ Matt. x. 18; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13. *Βαρθολομαῖος* is a patronymic, the *son of Talmai* (2 K. xiii. 37). St. John alone uses his proper name Nathanael.

²⁸ John i. 43-51.

²⁹ Two sites have been assigned

for Cana. 1. The traditional site is at *Kefr Kenna*, a small village about 4½ miles N.W. of Nazareth. It now contains only the ruins of a church said to stand over the house in which the miracle was performed, and—doubtless much older—the fountain from which the water for the miracle was brought. 2. Dr. Robinson, however, places Cana at a village situated farther north, about 5 miles north of *Seffurieh* (Sepphoris) and 9 of Nazareth, near the present *Jesat*, the *Jotapata* of the Jewish wars. This village still bears the name of *Kana-el-jelik*.

and who would naturally invite his friend Philip, together with his fellow-townsmen Peter and Andrew, and their friend, the remaining and unnamed disciple. That all were present is clearly implied in the statement, "Both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage;" and this is most important as establishing the fact, that our Saviour's first miracle was wrought in the presence of these "witnesses chosen before," and especially of John, who alone of the four evangelists records the incident.

This unexpected influx of guests, though welcomed with the hospitality of the East, entailed serious inconvenience on the bridegroom's limited resources; for the family seems to have been of the same lowly station as our Lord's. The wine, which it had doubtless required an effort to provide, ran short. Mary, who now appears again, for the first time since those early events, all of which she had "kept in her heart" and "pondered in her mind," thought she saw the opportunity to call forth the divine power of her Son. That this was involved in her words, "They have no wine" (and not, as some say, a hint of the propriety of his withdrawing, with his disciples, which, by the bye, would have been an insult to the host), seems clear from his reply, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come!" The original conveys nothing of bluntness by the first word, the same by which Jesus addressed his mother in the very climax of his tenderness upon the cross; but yet the choice of it, instead of "Mother," is a sign of that new relation which appears throughout the whole scene. It is hard to treat the subject with plainness and yet with reverence; but the difficulty is one of expression rather than of understanding. The man Jesus had, in childhood and youth, been subject to his parents; but such subjection was no longer becoming to Jesus the Christ of God. There seems to have been, in the hint of Mary, something of that error which is carried to extremity by the Mariolaters, when they pray the Virgin to *command* her Son to give them their wishes. It was needful that our Saviour should correct this error, which affected the motive, the object, and the time for the exercise of his miraculous power. "What is it to me and thee?" "Mine hour is not yet come"—is, in effect, a declaration that he must not use his divine powers at the promptings even of a parent, nor for any private object, nor till the fit season, of which the Spirit within him was sole judge. But what is the "hour" that he

speaks of as "not yet come?" The special use of this phrase elsewhere, for the great crisis of his work, is apt to make us forget that its primary sense is more general, "My season or opportunity is not yet come." But that interpretation is too narrow, which makes it refer to the wine not being yet exhausted. It is a rebuke of the impatience, which would not wait his time, though followed by the condescension of performing the miracle asked for, as the first example of those which should follow in due season. Mary received the rebuke without discouragement; and, as the friend of the family, she commands the servants to hold themselves at his disposal.

The details of the miracle are too familiar to need relation; but we must not omit to notice the points in which it forms a type of all Christ's miracles:—"This did Jesus, *as the beginning of his miracles*;" not only the first in time, but the inauguration of the great principle of all his miracles, at once to "make manifest his glory" and to cause "his disciples to believe on him." We may observe, in passing, that these words dispose, once for all, of the many childish legends about our Lord's miracles as a child.

We can not here discuss the whole doctrine of miracles. It is enough to observe that a miracle is a plain and manifest exercise by a man, or by God at the call of a man, of those powers which belong only to the Creator and Lord of nature; and this for the declared object of attesting that a divine mission is given to that man. It is not the *wonder*, the exception to common experience, that constitutes the *miracle*, as is assumed both in the popular use of the word, and by most objectors against miracles. No phenomenon in nature, however unusual, no event in the course of God's providence, however unexpected, is a miracle, unless it can be traced to the agency of man (including prayer under the term agency), and unless it be put forth as proof of a divine mission. *Prodigies* and *special providences* are not miracles. On the other hand, it is a mere *petitio principii* to argue against all miracles, on the ground that if we could see the secret manner of God's working, we might find them to be consistent with some higher law unknown to our experience. For it is not so much the violation of law, as the manifest application of it to a special occasion, that attests the immediate power of God. As has been beautifully observed, in the case before us, there is nothing wonderful in the mere fact that Christ could turn water into wine, for he does the same every autumn by the vital chemistry of nature. There is nothing wonderful in the means, for all creation was effected by his word: "He spake,

and it was done." The miracle consists in the circumstances which, by the direct utterance of that word, and the absence of those intermediate agencies, isolate his power for our plain-er perception and conviction. It is our blindness that fails to see that power in the laws of nature : it is his mercy that reveals it in their apparent interruption.

These principles, which are more or less accepted by the common sense of all mankind, as we see in the alleged heathen miracles, and the pretensions of magic, were familiar to the Jews through the miracles of the Old Covenant, and formed the ground of their faith in Moses, and therefore the basis of their religion. Their Rabbis distinguished true miracles from false by six chief tests :—(1) The *object* must be worthy of the Divine Author ; (2) The performance must be *public*, and (3) submitted to the *senses*, so that men might judge of their reality ; (4) The mode of working must be *independent of second causes* ; (5) They must be attested by *contemporaneous evidence*, (6) recorded by a *monument*, or in some form equally permanent. It may be added, as a condition highly satisfactory, though not perhaps essential, that the *occasion* should be natural, unsought, and purely incidental :—a condition strikingly fulfilled in the miracles of Christ, and as strikingly violated by the elaborate preparations and cunning excuses of pretenders to miraculous power. These tests, laid down by the Jews themselves, bound them to believe Christ if he fulfilled them ; and their manifest fairness makes them equally binding on all men. How perfectly they were satisfied in the miracle before us, as the type of all the rest, we need only indicate very briefly. (1) Besides the *benevolent purpose* manifest, with scarcely an exception,²⁹ in the miracles of Him who "went about doing good," we can trace in most cases a deeper meaning, often symbolical of the highest truths. In the present instance, he not only provided a quantity of wine much beyond the present necessity, and sanctified its moderate enjoyment, but he gave a lesson of his own creative power. (2) The miracle was performed with exactly that kind and degree of publicity which is the most satisfactory ; not on a public stage, before an audience excited by vague curiosity, prepared to keep each other and the performer in countenance, and already for the most part indicating their sympathy by their presence, while close criticism is im-

²⁹ The one exception, that of the barren fig-tree, where judgment seems to take the place of mercy, gave a lesson to the by-standers well worthy of the Divine Author of the Miracle.

possible; but in the midst of a moderate number of persons, sitting familiarly together, most of them strangers, but a few already chosen to be fit witnesses of all his works. (3) The subjection of the result of the miracle to the senses of those present, first in the pouring out of the water, and then in the form of the excellent wine, which they continued to enjoy during the seven days of the feast, is rendered the more striking by what science has taught us of the arts of conjurors in like cases.³⁰ Here is no possible room for the chemistry of colored fluids or the preparation of glasses to impose upon the taste. The truth of the scene is the more vivid from the tinge of humor with which the friend chosen to preside over the feast (the *thalíarchus*) rallies the unconscious bridegroom. (4) The independence of all second causes was secured by the nature of the vessels used, those set apart for purification, and therefore never even tinged with any thing but the purest water. (5) The contemporary evidence was abundantly furnished by the guests, and especially the disciples; and (6) its permanent record is handed down to us in the Gospel of St. John.

But for that law of our weak nature, which makes repetition needful for permanent impression, this miracle alone would have been enough to establish our Saviour's claims. It produced that effect upon his disciples. They had come to him before, with a sort of general trust that they had found the Christ; but that feeling was now formed into complete conviction. It had still to be ripened into a living principle, strong enough to conquer all doubts, for this is not the last time we are told that "his disciples believed in him." Thus does their experience teach the progressive character of true faith.

Nor must we fail to notice that our Saviour made this first public "manifestation of his glory" while he was satisfying the claims of social duty, and in this respect also "made like unto his brethren." We have seen him in the bosom of the family, now we behold him in the circle of society, blessing both, and fulfilling the laws of both, even the law of innocent pleasure; and interposing, by his divine power at a moment of pressure, to supply a want that was not one of the mere

³⁰ It is hardly possible to overrate the services to the cause of truth which have been rendered in this way, not only by men of science, but by professors of the arts of mock-magic; for example, by Sir David

Brewster's *Natural Magic* and Robert Houdin's *Memoirs*.—On the measure employed, see the *Old Testament History*, Appendix on WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

necessaries of life. "The Son of Man came eating and drinking."

In the fact that his first feast was a marriage feast, we see him sanctifying the divine ordinance of marriage, nay, even the festivities connected with it. This marked sanction, thus early in his course, may be regarded as a substitute for his own literal conformity to his brethren in the marriage state. It exhibited his perfect sympathy with a condition of life which his peculiar lot forbade his accepting: his only bride is the whole Church, which shares his love and life in glory; but no mortal bosom might divide the burden of his humiliation upon earth:

"Living, He own'd no nuptial vow,
No bower to Fancy dear:
Love's very self—for Him no need
To nurse, on earth, the heavenly seed:
Yet comfort in His eye we read
For bridal joy and fear."²¹

Nor ought we to pass unnoticed the views which some expositors have put forth concerning the mystic meaning of the miracle. The first miracle of Moses, the minister of condemnation, was to turn water—the all-pervading medium of the wants of life—into *blood*; but Christ's first miracle was to turn the same medium into *wine*, the quickener and gladdener of life.

§ 8. The marriage at Cana concludes what may be called the more private opening of our Saviour's ministry. "He came unto his own,"—first in the narrow circle of the few friends connected with his family; and all that follows justifies our applying to this narrow circle the statement, that "his own received him not;" and St. John expressly states that "neither did his brethren believe on him," when they taunted him with the comparative privacy of his miracles.²² Even his mother's faith seems thus far to have had in it more of nature than of grace; and, for the rest, his five disciples were his only converts. With them, and his mother, and his brethren, he retired to Capernaum, on the west shore of the Lake of Galilee, a city which he more than once selected for his residence in preference to Nazareth.²³ This abode of the first disciples with Jesus at Capernaum marks the intimate

²¹ Keble: *Christian Year: Matrimony*.

²² John vii. 3-5.

²³ The site of Capernaum is uncertain; and the doom which our Lord pronounced against it and the other unbelieving cities of the plain of Gen-

nesareth has been remarkably fulfilled. The spots which lay claim to its site are: 1. *Khan Minyeh*, a mound of ruins which takes its name from an old khan hard by. This mound is situated close upon the sea-shore at

personal nature of their connection with him, and implies the incessant opportunities which that intercourse afforded for their learning of him the truths of which they were to be witnesses. It must not be confounded with that first *public* appearance at Capernaum which succeeds his baptism in the order of the first three Evangelists.* "They continued there not many days;" for a reason which presently appears; "the Jews' passover was at hand."[†] This notice fixes the marriage at Cana to a time not long before the Passover; an epoch from which we can reckon back, within pretty narrow limits of error, to our Saviour's temptation and his baptism, making in all about three months from the time when "he began to be about thirty years of age."

the north-western extremity of the plain (now *El Ghuceir*). 2. Three miles north of *Khan Minyeh* is the other claimant, *Tell Hûm*,—ruins of walls and foundations covering a space of half a mile long by a quarter wide, on a point of the shore projecting into the lake and backed by a

very gently rising ground. *Khan-Minyeh*, *Et-Tabighah*, and *Tell Hûm*, are all, without doubt, ancient sites, but it is impossible to say which of them represents Capernaum, which Chorazin, or which Bethsaida.

* See Chapter VIII., §§ 9, 11.

† John ii. 12, 13.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) THE PUBLICANS.

THE Greek word (*τελωναι*) translated "Publicans," describes the *portitores*, or inferior officers employed as collectors of the Roman revenue. But the Latin word *Publicani*, from which the English of the A.V. has been taken, was applied to a higher order of men. The Roman senate farmed the *vectigalia* (direct taxes) and the *portoria* (customs, including the *octroi* on goods carried into or out of cities) to capitalists who undertook to pay a given sum into the treasury (*publicum*), and hence received the name of *publicani*. Contracts of this kind fell naturally into the hands of the *equites*, as the richest

class of Romans. In the provinces were managing directors; and under them were the *portitores*, the actual custom-house officers. The latter were commonly natives of the province in which they were stationed. The word *τελωναι*, which etymologically might have been used of the *publicani* properly so called, was used popularly, and in the N. T. exclusively, of the *portitores*.

The system was essentially a vicious one. The *publicani* encouraged their agents, the *portitores*, in the most vexatious or fraudulent exactions. They overcharged whenever they had an opportunity (Luke iii. 13). They brought false charges of smuggling in the hope of extorting

hush-money (Luke xix. 8). The employment brought out all the besetting vices of the Jewish character. The strong feeling of many Jews as to the absolute unlawfulness of paying tribute at all made matters worse. The Scribes who discussed the question (Matt. xxii. 15) for the most part answered it in the negative. In addition to their other faults, accordingly, the Publicans of the N. T. were regarded as traitors and apostates, defiled by their frequent intercourse with the heathen, willing tools of the oppressor. They were classed with sinners (Matt. ix. 11, xi. 19), with harlots (Matt. xxi. 31, 32), with the heathen (Matt. xviii. 17). To eat and drink "with Publicans," seems to the Pharisaic mind incompatible with the character of a recognized Rabbi (Matt. ix. 11). They spoke in their scorn of our Lord as the friend of Publicans (Matt. xi. 19).

(B.)—PLACE OF OUR LORD'S BAPTISM.

The place of our Lord's baptism is not stated expressly. What is stated is, (1) that as St. John was a native of some "city in the hill-country of Judæa" (Luke i. 39), so his preaching, commencing "in the wilderness of Judæa" (Matt. iii. 1), embraced "all the country about Jordan" (Luke iii. 3), and drew persons from Galilee, as far off as Nazareth (Mark i. 9) and Bethsaida (John i. 35, 40, 44), as well as from Jerusalem; (2) that the baptism of the multitude from Jerusalem and Judæa preceded that of our Lord (Matt. iii. 6, 13; Mark i. 5, 9); (3) that our Lord's baptism was also distinct from that of the said multitude (Luke iii. 21); and (4) that he came from Nazareth in Galilee, and not from Jerusalem or Judæa, to be baptized. The inference from


all which would seem to be, (1) that the first (*τὸ πρῶτον*) baptisms of St. John took place at the lower ford near Jericho, to which not only he himself, a native of Judæa, but all Jerusalem and Judæa likewise, would naturally resort as being the nearest. (2) That his second baptisms were at the upper ford, or Bethabara (John i. 28), whither he had arrived in the course of his preachings, and were designed for the inhabitants of the more northern parts of the Holy Land, among whom was Jesus, from Galilee. (3) That his third and last baptisms were in the neighborhood of Ænon and Salim (John iii. 23), still further to the north. Thus St. John would seem to have moved upward gradually toward Galilee, the seat of Herod's jurisdiction, by whom he was destined to be apprehended and executed; while our Lord, coming from Galilee, probably by way of Samaria, as in the converse case, would seem to have met him half way, and to have been baptized at Bethabara, in the ford nearest to that locality—a ford which had been the scene of the first recorded crossing. The tradition which asserts Christ to have been baptized in the ford near Jericho, has been obliged to invent a Bethabara near that spot, of which no trace exists in history, to appear consistent with Scripture.

BETHABARA, that is, *the house of ford* or *passage*, described as "beyond," that is, on the eastern side of the Jordan (John i. 28), was probably the upper fords, higher up than Jericho, where the little river Jabbok (*Zerka*) enters the Jordan. But the name of Bethabara in John i. 28, is doubtful. All the oldest MSS. have not Bethabara, but Bethany, a reading which Origen states to have obtained in almost all the copies of his time, though altered by him in his edition of the Gospel on topographical grounds. In favor of Bethabara

are, (a) the extreme improbability of so familiar a name as Bethany being changed by copyists into one so unfamiliar as Bethabara, while the reverse—the change from an unfamiliar to a familiar name—is of frequent occurrence. (b) The fact that Origen, while admitting that the majority of MSS. were in favor of Bethany, decided notwithstanding for Bethabara. (c) That Bethabara was still known in the days of Eusebius, and greatly resorted to by persons desirous of baptism. It must not, however, be overlooked that if Bethany be accepted, the definition “beyond Jordan” still remains, and therefore another place must be intended than the well-known residence of Lazarus.

ÆNON is the Greek form of the Chaldee *Enanan*, “fountains;” hence we read in the evangelist, that “John was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there.” It was evidently west

of the Jordan (comp. John iii. 22 with 26, and with i. 28); but beyond this there is no statement in the narrative itself fixing the situation. The only direct testimony we possess is that of Eusebius and Jerome, who both affirm unhesitatingly (*Onom.* “Ænon”) that it existed in their day near the Jordan, eight Roman miles south of Scythopolis. The name of *Salim* has been discovered by Mr. Van de Velde (*Syr. & Pal.* ii. 345, 6) in a position exactly in accordance with the notice of Eusebius, viz., six English miles south of *Beisân* (Scythopolis), and two miles west of the Jordan. It fulfills also the statement of the text, that the place contained abundance of water. “The brook of *Waay Chusneh* runs close to it, a splendid fountain gushes out beside the *Wely*, and rivulets wind about in all directions. . . . Of few places in Palestine could it so truly be said, ‘Here is much water.’”



Sea of Galilee.

CHAPTER VIII.

FIRST YEAR OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY. FROM HIS FIRST PASSOVER TO HIS SECOND VISIT TO JERUSALEM, PROBABLY AT THE PASSOVER. A.D. 27-28.

- § 1. Beginning of Christ's ministry at Jerusalem at the Passover. § 2. The *First Passover*. Christ purifies the Temple. Contrast with his last appearance there. The Jews demand a sign. His prediction concerning the Temple of His Body. His converts at this Passover; and his reserve in trusting them. § 3. Christ and Nicodemus. § 4. Jesus leaves Jerusalem for the country of Judæa, and gains converts, who are baptized by his disciples. John's final testimony to Christ. § 5. John rebukes Herod Antipas for Herodias's sake, and is cast into prison. § 6. Christ retires to Galilee. The Samaritan woman and her fellow-townsmen of Sychar. § 7. Jesus in Galilee. The prophet without honor in his own country. Difficulty as to the Gospel Harmony at this point. § 8. Second visit of Jesus to Cana. His second Galilean miracle: healing of the courtier's son. § 9. *Beginning of the Gospel from Galilee*: its significance. Narrative of the first three Evangelists derived from Galilean sources. Their external means of information and their inspiration. § 10. Christ began by proclaiming the kingdom of heaven as *at hand*. Distinction between this and John the Baptist's preaching. He teaches in the Synagogues. Proclaims himself at Nazareth as the

Messiah, and is rejected by his fellow-townsmen. § 11. Jesus at Capernaum. His ministry by the Lake of Galilee. Final call of Peter and Andrew, James and John. Its relation to their first call. § 12. A Sabbath in the synagogue at Capernaum. The demoniac healed. The question of demoniacal possession. The devil confesses Christ, but is silenced by him. Fame of the miracle. Healing of Peter's wife's mother. Miracles in the evening. § 13. Christ leaves Capernaum next morning. His *First Galilean Circuit*. Healing of the leper. § 14. Jesus returns to Capernaum. Healing of the paralytic in presence of the Pharisees and Doctors. Christ claims the divine prerogative of forgiving sin. § 15. The call of Matthew. Various examples of Christ's miracles. § 16. The "Feast of the Jews" of John v., probably the *Second Passover* of Christ's ministry. He goes up to Jerusalem. Healing of the cripple at Bethesda. The Jews charge Christ with Sabbath-breaking. His first great discourse in vindication of his divine authority.

§ 1. THAT Christ should begin his public ministry at Jerusalem was equally in accordance with the fitness of the case, and with the expectations raised by prophecy:—"Jehovah, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to *his temple*." Nor was there any reason so suitable for his appearance there, as the Feast of Passover, which presented the most striking type of him, and at which the Jews were gathered, not only from all the land, but from the countries of the Dispersion. Hence the Passovers during our Saviour's ministry are most important epochs, and, indeed, they furnish the only general chronological data for its course. But we are met, in the outset, by the strange fact that, with one exception, these Passovers are mentioned only by St. John. All the Evangelists relate the events of that last great Passover, to which Jesus went up to suffer as the true Paschal Lamb. But, with this exception, the first three Evangelists confine their narrative to our Lord's ministry in Galilee, though not without incidental allusions to his visits to Judæa. Immediately after his baptism, they record the beginning of his ministry in Galilee; and the word "returned," in Matthew and Luke, might be taken for his first return from the banks of the Jordan, but for the note of time, and the motive of the journey, supplied by Matthew and Mark, "when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison." This agrees with the beginning of St. John's 4th chapter, and interposes all the events recorded in his first three chapters. In the same way, the visits to Judæa mentioned in John v. and vii. are passed over by the other Evangelists,¹ who however imply, on various occasions, the not unfrequent exercise of

¹ Unless the allusion in Luke ix. 51 refers to the latter journey.

Christ's ministry in Jerusalem³ and Judæa. And this is accounted for by two facts, which must never be lost sight of in studying the Gospels, that *the first three Evangelists wrote from Galilean sources of information*, and that *the Gospel of St. John was supplemental to theirs*.

In these two facts we have the key to the diversities between the first three Evangelists and the fourth, respecting both the *scene* and the *duration* of the public ministry of Christ.⁴

§ 2. Returning to this first Passover of A.D. 27, the first, that is, in our Saviour's ministry, for he had doubtless gone up regularly to Jerusalem since the recorded visit at the age of twelve, we see him at once exercising the highest authority of a prophet and a reformer, by cleansing the temple. The selfish spirit which had prevailed since the Captivity, in place of the open idolatries of earlier times, had made the very services of the sanctuary the occasion for profaning it. Sheep and oxen and doves were sold within the sacred precincts for the sacrifices, and money-changers traded there upon the convenience of those who came to pay the half-shekel tax for divine worship. Jesus drove them from the temple with an authority of which his "scourge of small cords" was but the sign. The indignation with which he overthrew the tables of the money-changers forms a marked contrast to his gentler command to the sellers of doves to "take these things hence." Still more striking is the contrast between his admonition, "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise," and his denunciation of the same conduct on his last visit to the temple:—"It is written, my house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations; *but ye have made it a den of thieves*." Those critics, who suppose the two narratives to be a confused account of one event, are insensible to the transition, which the renewed and confirmed selfishness of the offenders forced upon our Saviour, from the reformer urging amendment, to the judge passing a final condemnation.⁵

His proceedings were watched by his disciples and the Jews with equal astonishment. The former, reminded of the words of one of those Psalms which most clearly referred to the Messiah, beheld a new proof of his divine authority.⁶ The

³ See Matt. iv. 25, xv. 1, xxiii. 37; Luke x. 38.

⁴ See *Notes and Illustrations* (A), THE SCENE OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY; (B), DURATION OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY.

⁵ John ii. 13-17.

⁶ Ps. lxix. 9. See the whole psalm, for its pre-eminently Messianic character.

Jews were sensible of the same inference, but they resisted its admission. Their very demand for a *sign* of his authority proved that they understood the claim. His answer looked forward, at this very commencement of his course, to its highest consummation, while it rebuked them more keenly than ever by predicting their share in the end.⁶ This was the first occasion on which the Jews made the demand, which they so often repeated, not of *evidence* to justify belief—this was abundantly supplied by the very spirit of his proceedings, as well as by the miracles which we are presently told that he performed—but of a *supernatural sign* to compel belief; that foolish demand which is made in every age by hearts hardened against moral evidence, and which equally fails to convince them. Jesus replied, as on other occasions, by refusing the demand made in a spirit of defiance, but at the same time intimating that the sign would one day be given, and that to their confusion. For this end their evil spirit toward him was already preparing. They who demanded to know his authority for rebuking their profanation of God's house would be carried on by that evil spirit, not only to courses involving the destruction of that house, but to the destruction of the true temple of which that was but the shrine, the "house not made with hands," which formed in his person the dwelling-place of God. And when their rage had achieved that triumph, he would give them the clearest sign of his authority, by raising up again in three days that edifice, whose glory infinitely surpassed the forty years' work of Herod on Mount Zion. "He spake of the temple of his body." His words had an *apparent* sense, which was all that their carnal minds could see at present; and even this they willfully perverted by the alteration of one word, in order to make out a charge of blasphemy against him. He said, "*Destroy* this temple"—in the tone of indignant remonstrance, like, "Fill ye up the measure of your fathers." And the very means they used to fulfill his words was by suborning false witnesses to make him say, "*I will* destroy it." Hidden beneath this apparent sense, was not only the prediction of the destruction of the temple by the Romans, as the only cure for the pollutions they had brought upon it; but the deeper spiritual prophecy of his own death and resurrection, the end of which would be the establishment of the true temple in heaven; where the seer of Patmos beheld no visible temple, "for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it." Even his disciples did not perceive

⁶ John ii. 18-22.⁷ Rev. xxi. 23.

this meaning till after his resurrection. "They remembered," as soon as they saw his zeal for his Father's house, the Scripture which marked this as a character of the Christ; but it needed reflection after the event, to call to their remembrance the true import of his life and sayings; and it is *that* remembrance, recalled by the Holy Spirit, that St. John has recorded for our learning. It is another indication of the progressive character of their faith, that only then "did they believe the Scripture, and the word which Jesus had said."

These deeds of authority, and the miracles which Jesus performed at the Passover, gained him for the first time many converts—converts at least in outward profession. But here we meet with one of the most striking and affecting records in his whole history. "Many *believed* (or *trusted*) in his name; but Jesus did not *trust* himself to them." It is difficult to express the antithesis involved in the repetition of the word, which our version wholly loses. But it is not difficult to read the lesson of the *reserve* with which Christ treated these first converts of his public ministry. A reason is given, which both explains his conduct and testifies to his omniscient power of discerning the hearts of men. He saw the elements of instability in some, and of hypocrisy and perhaps even treachery in others, which would surely bring disgrace on his cause; and he would not own them, or attach himself to them, in such a manner as to imperil that cause through them. Probably these converts, in their carnal and selfish zeal, began with the mistake which was afterward repeated by so many of his followers, by looking for an independent kingdom; and he would not commit himself to them as king of the Jews.*

§ 3. But there were a few in whom he did place confidence. The type of these is the ruler Nicodemus, a man by no means free from the prejudices of his nation and his order, but showing the first elements of true faith in his hearty recognition of the divine authority attested by the miracles of Christ.⁹ This conviction, which many of his fellow-rulers shared, he had the honesty to avow:—"Rabbi, *we* know that thou art a teacher sent from God;" and, though there was something of proud reserve, as well as of moral cowardice, in the manner of his coming to Christ, his sincerity contrasted very favorably with the hollow demonstrations which Jesus had rejected. To him the Lord unfolded for the first time the deepest mysteries of his kingdom: the need of regeneration to enter it; the death

* John ii. 23-25.

⁹ John iii. 1, 2.

of the Son of Man and only-begotten Son of God for the salvation of all who should believe in him; and the condemnation of the world for its willful unbelief. In this discourse the Three Persons of the Trinity are all revealed in their working for man's redemption: the Father loving the world so as even to give his Son to die for man; the Son coming down from heaven to be lifted up on the cross, and ascending to heaven again; and the Spirit renewing the hearts of those who should enter the kingdom of heaven. The detailed exposition of our Lord's discourses, however, does not fall within the plan of this work.¹⁰

§ 4. Our Lord's discernment of the premature and unstable professions of the many who believed on him would be a sufficient reason for his retirement from Jerusalem to the country districts of Judæa, where he gradually, but surely, gathered converts, who were baptized, not by himself, but by his disciples.¹¹ His converts soon exceeded those of John, who still continued to baptize, and who was now at Ænon, near Salim, a spot which numerous streamlets make very convenient for an encampment.¹² The people were now perplexed by something like an appearance of rivalry between the two new teachers; and one of the Jews,¹³ who had engaged in a controversy upon purifying with John's disciples, came to him to ask, seemingly in a somewhat taunting spirit, how it was that he, to whom he had borne witness near the Jordan, was apparently superseding him in his ministry. John took the occasion to bear to Christ a final testimony, no less remarkable for its explicit statements of Gospel truth than for its profound humility and self-renunciation. Reminding both parties to the controversy that *he* had always insisted on the superiority of Christ to himself, as being the very purpose of his mission, he marks this as the divinely appointed order:—"He *must* increase, I must decrease."¹⁴ And to this law he not merely submits, but derives from it unbounded satisfaction. Likening himself to the bridegroom's friend (or *paranymph*) at a wedding, rejoicing at the bridegroom's voice, while Christ rejoiced over his pure spouse, the Church about to be re-

¹⁰ John iii. 1-21.

¹¹ John iii. 22: comp. John iv. 2. The word "tarried" seems to imply a considerable time.

¹² John iii. 23, 24. See p. 216. The words "John was not yet cast into prison" form the only notice of the Baptist's imprisonment in St. John's

Gospel; a mark of its *supplemental* character.

¹³ John iii. 25. The best MSS. have the singular, *μετὰ Ἰουδαίου* (not *Ἰουδαίων*).

¹⁴ John iii. 30. So *must* (ἐεῖ) is used in Matt. xxvi. 54; Mark viii. 31, ix. 11, 12; Luke xxiii. 17, xxiv. 7 44; John xx. 9; Acts i. 6

deemed, he declares, "This my joy therefore is fulfilled." Though himself destined to remain outside of the Christian Church, he concludes his testimony by pointing to his disciples and all his hearers the way within it. The limits of his own mission, strictly defined from the first, were now reached; and he sends them, for the measureless gifts of God's Spirit, to Him who had come from heaven and was above all, promising everlasting life if they believed on the Son, and denouncing the abiding wrath of God on unbelievers.¹⁵

§ 5. Having thus stood faithful against the greatest temptation, probably, that ever assailed a mere man, the same temptation to which an angel had yielded, of rivalry with the Son of God, John could carry a good conscience into the prison to which he was soon afterward consigned. Thus far we have only seen John preaching and baptizing in the wilderness and near the Jordan; but it would seem that, as he advanced up the river into Galilee, the interest which Herod Antipas always retained in the Jewish religion led him to wish to hear the prophet. John appeared before him in a guise unlike the delicate attire of the courtier, with his wild Nazarite locks, and his prophet's mantle of camel's-hair, such as Elijah had when he showed himself to Ahab. In the court, as in the wilderness, he went straight to the object of his mission, repentance and reformation from positive sin. Herod had married Herodias, the self-divorced wife of his half-brother Philip; and, regardless alike of the king's favor and the woman's vengeance, he said, "It is not lawful for thee to have her!" For this offense, Herod, instigated by Herodias, and casting to the winds all the better feelings that had led him to send for John, added to all the crimes which he had had such an opportunity to renounce, that of shutting up John in prison. How reluctant he was to proceed further, both from respect for John and fear of the people, who held the Baptist for a prophet, and how his conscience troubled him for this step, we shall soon see.¹⁶

§ 6. Meanwhile the Pharisees, who may be supposed to have aided Herodias in exciting her husband against John, prepared to attack Jesus in his turn, for they had been alarmed by hearing that he made and baptized more disciples than John. Jesus heard of their plots and of John's imprisonment about the same time; and he resolved to remove from Judæa

¹⁵ John iii. 24-36.

¹⁶ Matt. xiv. 3-5; Mark vi. 17-20;
Luke iii. 19, 20. Concerning Herod

Antipas and Herodias, see chap. v. §
3, p. 102.

into Galilee." This may seem a strange step, considering that it was Herod who had imprisoned John. But our Lord's real danger was from the Jews; and in the retired district round the Lake of Galilee, he would be safe from Herod till He gave him some personal offense.

The route which Christ followed is particularly marked by John: "He must needs go through Samaria,"¹⁷ that is, the district, not the city. It is by no means to be assumed that this was just the natural route. Even from Jerusalem, travelers often followed the route up the Jordan, to avoid contact with the hated Samaritans; and the appearance of a Jewish traveler at Jacob's well was unusual enough to cause surprise. But from our Lord's starting-point, on the Jordan and apparently rather high up its course, the valley of the river was much the nearest road to the Lake of Galilee; and he went out of his way when he turned to the left through a pass leading into the valley of Shechem. Hence St. John's use of that "*must*," the force of which we had just now to notice. It marks the order in which our Saviour's public mission was fulfilled. Driven from Jerusalem and Judæa, he repaired to the more ancient sanctuary of Israel, where Abraham, Jacob, and Joshua had set up the worship of Jehovah. Sitting by the well which tradition cherished as the gift of Jacob,¹⁸ in the valley between mounts Gerizim and Ebal, he expounded to a degraded woman of the half-heathen people of Sychar,¹⁹ who yet boasted to be the true children of the patriarchs, his own great gift of living water in the heart, and the spiritual worship which should supersede that both of Jerusalem and

¹⁷ John iv. 1-3; Matt. iv. 12.

¹⁸ John iv. 4.

¹⁹ The site of this well is one of the few special localities of our Lord's life which is absolutely undisputed. It lies about 1½ mile E. of the city, close to the lower road, and just beyond the wretched hamlet of *Balâta*. Among the Mahometans and Samaritans it is known as *Bir el-Yakûb*, or *'Ain Yakûb*; the Christians sometimes call it *Bir es-Samariyeh*—"the well of the Samaritan woman." Formerly there was a square hole opening into a carefully-built vaulted chamber, about 10 feet square, in the floor of which was the true mouth of the well. Now a portion of the vault has fallen in and completely covered

up the mouth, so that nothing can be seen above but a shallow pit half filled with stones and rubbish. The well is deep—75 ft. when last measured—and there was probably a considerable accumulation of rubbish at the bottom. Sometimes it contains a few feet of water, but at others it is quite dry. It is entirely excavated in the solid rock, perfectly round, 9 ft. in diameter, with the sides hewn smooth and regular.

¹⁹ A contemptuous variety of the name of Shechem. The phrase "a woman of Samaria," which our translators have used to express "Samaritan" in the feminine, is apt to mislead the English reader.

Gerizim; and her eagerness to impart the news to her fellow-townsmen brought to him disciples, who at once received him with that spiritual faith in his true mission which the Jews had wanted: "We have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the CHRIST, the Saviour of the world."²⁰

§ 7. Having stayed two days at Sychar, Jesus proceeded into Galilee. "For Jesus himself testified," says St. John, "that a prophet hath no honor in his own country."²¹ We can not stay to discuss whether this is an explanation of our Lord's reason for leaving Judæa, "his own country" by birth,²² or whether it is not rather a prophecy of the reception he was about to meet in Galilee, which is certainly the sense of "his own country" elsewhere, as it was the country of his parents and of his own early life—whether his own emphatic testimony, that a prophet hath no honor in his own country, was a reason for his seeking honor where he might have it, or rather a motive for going forward to meet the shame which he came to bear. Whichever be the true meaning, the saying must at least be rescued from that degraded sense in which it is so often quoted, as if it were the just complaint of disappointed pride. It was certainly not uttered in this spirit by Him who said, "I receive not honor from men." We think of worldly *honor*, where our Saviour spoke of that *acceptance* of his mission, which alone is true honor to a prophet of God. On his first arrival in Galilee, this honor seemed to be paid to him; for the report of his miracles at Jerusalem, brought by the Galileans who had gone up to the Passover, secured him a favorable reception; but it was only in appearance. His marked rejection at his own city of Nazareth²³ soon proved that, whether the first application of the words just quoted be to Jerusalem or to Galilee, they were true alike of both. They were, in fact, uttered by our Saviour as the enunciation of a great general principle, and one much higher than the worldly maxim, that familiarity breeds contempt. The saying was a sorrowful statement of the truth, that they to whom the Gospel is brought nearest are the least ready to receive it; that the prophet is rejected, even where

²⁰ John iv. 1-42. Bishop Horsley's Sermons on this text are full of instruction: though perhaps he presses too far his argument, that the Samaritans had learned from the Pentateuch alone to expect a spiritual and universal Saviour.

²¹ John iv. 43-45.

²² That this doubtful allusion is St.

John's only notice of Christ's birth-place, furnishes another instance of the supplemental character of his Gospel.

²³ Luke iv. 16-31. The question, whether the rejection of Christ at Nazareth belongs to this or a later time, is one of the chief difficulties of the Gospel Harmony.

he *ought* to be first accepted, "in his own country" where he is best known, as Jesus was already known in Galilee by his miracle in Cana, nay, as he elsewhere adds, "in his *own house*."

This question of interpretation is closely connected with another, which involves one of the greatest difficulties of the Gospel Harmony:—Did our Saviour, upon this return from his first Passover, at once commence his public ministry in Galilee, or did he spend another period in comparative privacy? The former seems the natural inference from the first three Gospels; though it is equally true that, taken alone, they would suggest the still earlier date, immediately upon Christ's baptism. On the other hand, St. John seems to imply that the healing of the nobleman's son was the only great incident of this second visit of Jesus to Galilee;²⁴ but the supplemental character of his Gospel makes it unsafe to argue from his silence, nor are the words "after this," at the beginning of Chap. V., a mark of immediate sequence. If the feast of John v. 1 be a Passover, it is almost necessary to place our Lord's first circuit before it; because we can hardly suppose a whole year to have been occupied by the events of John iii. and iv., nor does it seem possible to admit the necessary inference, that two full years of our Lord's ministry passed before he chose his Apostles. If the feast of John v. 1 be the Feast of Tabernacles, we have half a year for those events, and a year and a half for our Lord's ministry in Galilee, up to his last Passover. The question seems incapable of positive decision; but the balance of probability appears to point to the order indicated above.

§ 8. On entering Galilee from Samaria, Jesus went to Cana, led apparently by the same connection which had before caused his presence at the marriage there.²⁵ His return came to the ears of a courtier of Herod Antipas, whose son was at the point of death with a fever. The manner of the courtier's coming to Christ illustrates the spirit in which "the Galileans received Him." There seems to have been an expectation that he would be lavish of his miracles for the benefit of his own countrymen, with very little thought of their higher purpose. The courtier appears to have come, like Naaman to Elisha, thinking that his visit was an honor to the prophet, who would doubtless go back with him at once. The plural form of our Lord's rebuke—"Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe,"—proves it to have been

²⁴ John iv. 54.²⁵ John iv. 46-54.

meant for the Galileans in general. They had long known him; his first miracle had been performed at this very town, and they had seen what he had done at Jerusalem; and the evidence of his mission was complete. But they were heedless of its real object, and seemed to think they had a right to any satisfaction of their curiosity. The courtier was too intent on his own distress to have patience for the lesson; but though there was impatience, there was also earnest faith, in his rejoinder,—“Sir, come down ere my child die.” This mixed state of mind our Lord treated with as much wisdom as compassion. Instead of going down with the courtier to Capernaum, he tells *him* to “go his way,” but with the assurance that “his child lived.” That the courtier began to understand the lesson of submission as well as faith, appears from the leisurely mode of his return. It was about noon when the conversation took place;²⁶ and the moderate journey from Cana to Capernaum could have been accomplished the same evening. But, in spite of the father’s impatience, he stays to rest his servants and horses; and when, on the following day, he is met with the joyful tidings, “Thy son liveth,” his first question proves that he was prepared for the event itself, and only anxious to connect it with the Saviour’s word; “he inquired of them the *hour* when he began to amend.” The answer sets the seal to the decisive evidence of the miracle, in which, as compared with the first miracle at Cana, we have the new feature, that it was performed at a distance from its object. At Cana, Christ speaks the word, and the father did not fail to mark the time, as it was just noon. At Capernaum, the effect follows at the same instant, the nature of the disease being such as to enable the by-standers to mark the very hour at which “the fever left him.”²⁷ The servants set out from Capernaum with the news, ignorant of what had passed at Cana, and find their message received as the confirmation of hope, rather than an unlooked-for deliverance from despair. Then did master and servant alike see the deeper grace which lay beneath the gift of healing, the new life to their own souls: “himself believed, and his whole house.” There remains but one wonder unexplained:—that a miracle resting on such evidence, and conveying such lessons, should not produce the like faith in all who read it.

This brief sojourn at Cana, and this great miracle, which the order of St. John seems to require us to place immedi-

²⁶ John iv. 52, 53.

²⁷ This marked cessation of a fever

is well known to those who have felt it.

ately after the return of Jesus from Jerusalem to Galilee, may be regarded as a preface to the opening of his public ministry in the latter country, which we may place about the beginning of A.D. 28.

§ 9. "*The word which began from Galilee*, after the baptism which John preached," is the description of our Saviour's ministry by St. Peter.²⁸ This view agrees so entirely with the order of the first three Evangelists, that, had we possessed their Gospels only, we should scarcely have suspected the interval which is filled up with such momentous events in the Gospel of St. John. The full view of the case, drawn from the comparison of all the four Gospels, seems to be this:—As the first experimental step in Christ's public ministry, he presented himself as the Son of God, the promised Messiah, among those Jews who claimed to be the pure children of Abraham, at the centre of their religious system, the Temple in Jerusalem. Not till they had rejected this special offer of grace to them, and plotted against his life, did he open his wider mission of mercy to the mixed race of the Galileans;²⁹ and their position in relation to the Jews of Judæa in some sense foreshadows the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles. Those higher privileges, of which the Judæan Jews boasted, proved the chief obstacle to their reception of Christ as the Saviour of sinners; and so he turned to "*the lost sheep of the house of Israel*." Thus, while his first open revelation as the promised Messiah was made in the Temple of Jerusalem at the Passover, the true beginning of his *Gospel*, in the stricter sense, as "*the word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ*," was first opened by the Galileans. If his public *ministry* began at Jerusalem, his open *preaching* began in Galilee. Perhaps this relation is implied in the peculiar phraseology of St. Luke, that "*Jesus returned, by the power of the Spirit, into Galilee*."³⁰ This course was in complete accordance with prophecy, which had marked out the very spot in Galilee, where Capernaum stood by the lake, on the borders of Zabulon and Naphthali, as the chief scene of the Messiah's ministry.³¹ Nor should we omit to observe the coincidence that, as the captivity of Israel had begun with the Galileans, so to them was first proclaimed the liberty of the Gospel.

²⁸ Acts x. 37.

²⁹ See *Notes and Illustrations* (C), GALILEE.

³⁰ Luke iv. 14: comp. Matt. iv. 12, Mark i. 14.

³¹ Is. ix. 1, 2; Matt. iv. 13-16. For the rendering of this difficult passage, see Bp. Lowth, *in loc.*

From this point the first three Evangelists begin their continuous narratives of our Saviour's life. What precedes this, in each of them, is introductory:—The birth and youth of John and Jesus, the ministry of John, and Christ's baptism and temptation. Of these matters it is not probable that either of the three Evangelists had any direct personal knowledge. St. Luke, who tells us that he followed those "who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," is most full on those first incidents which he could only have learned from the members of the Holy Family. All three give a brief account of the ministry of John the Baptist, received, no doubt, from those of his disciples who followed Christ. Their narrative of the temptation must have been derived by Matthew directly, by Mark and Luke at second-hand, from Him who passed through the conflict. After this, each of the three Gospels makes a pause, such as would be properly marked by the beginning of a new chapter, or even by making all that precedes a separate introduction. Their omission of the events meanwhile recorded by St. John is not surprising. Matthew, himself a native of Capernaum, naturally begins with our Lord's residence in that city, when, "leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum."²² Luke, who, as we have seen, obtained information from the Holy Family, makes Christ's rejection at Nazareth the first principal event. Mark, writing under the direction of Peter, begins with the call of that apostle and his fellow-fishermen on the shores of the Lake of Galilee. It is needless to discuss the refined question, Why did not St. Mark record those events of which Peter was the witness as well as John at Bethabara (or Bethany), at Cana, at Jerusalem, at Sychar, and again at Cana? Perhaps the extent to which Mark should be viewed as Peter's organ has been exaggerated. At all events, it is enough that John was an especially fit witness to that period, not only from his constant companionship, but from his deeper insight into his Master's teaching.

In all that has now been said, the higher authority of the Evangelists, as inspired writers, is left untouched. The whole doctrine of inspiration itself rests on the previous establishment of the character of the sacred writers as well-informed, competent, and honest witnesses. The same Lord, who promised the Spirit to guide his disciples into all the truth, and to bring to their remembrance all his words, chose those disciples to be "eye-witnesses and attendants of the

²² Matt. iv. 13.

word." It was from those who had this character that St. Luke claims to have had "a perfect understanding of all things from the very first," and therefore to be qualified to write of them. And the very Evangelist who records the promise of the Holy Spirit rests his own credibility on his external means of information, as well as on the internal assurance of the Spirit to his truth:—"He that *saw* it bare record, and his record is true: *and he knoweth* that he saith true, that ye might believe."²³ Inspiration gives an *authority* in addition to their *credibility*.

§ 10. The epoch thus chosen by the first three Evangelists, as the commencement of our Lord's public ministry, is most emphatically marked by the words of Luke: "Jesus returned *in the power of the Spirit* into Galilee."²⁴ The time had come, as he himself soon proclaimed at Nazareth, when the Spirit moved him to make a full and plain declaration of his Messiahship and his Gospel. All three Evangelists begin this portion of their narrative with the great fact of his proclamation of "the Gospel of the kingdom."²⁵ His first words echo those of his forerunner:—"The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the Gospel." He does not yet announce the kingdom of heaven as *come*, but only its *near approach*, as the call to the preparation of heart needful for entrance within its pale. This is not, at least in its primary sense, the language of expectation for that kingdom of glory, for which the Church still prays; for Christ proclaimed the real advent of the kingdom of grace and life in the hearts of penitent believers:—"Blessed are the poor in spirit, for *theirs is the kingdom of heaven*;"²⁶—"The publicans and harlots *enter into the kingdom of heaven* before you" (the Pharisees). But to all else, up to the very close of his ministry, Christ proclaimed the kingdom of heaven only as *nigh*. It only *came* to those who entered it with the preparation on which first John, and then Christ himself, insisted. But this was the great difference in their ministry. John never ceased to point to a far greater One who was coming after him: Christ declared that the fullness of time was come, and the prophecies were fulfilled in himself. The preparation required by John was *repentance* and *reformation*. Christ goes deeper, and besides repentance he demands *faith*,—readiness to believe from the heart the truths he came to teach. This was his claim in the outset of his ministry, re-

²³ John xix. 35; comp. xxi. 24.²⁴ Luke iv. 14.²⁵ Matt. iv. 17; Mark i. 14, 15;
Luko iv. 14, 15.²⁶ Matt. v. 3

serving for its course the full revelation of those truths and the spiritual exposition of that faith; the laws of the kingdom of heaven. Thus much, however, was clear from the first, that, in proclaiming the new order of things as a *kingdom*, Christ pointed to the fulfillment of the covenant with David, and claimed all the authority of his promised seed.

The news of his preaching soon spread through all the district of northern Galilee. Unlike John, who had lifted up his voice in the wilderness, and waited for converts to come out to him, Jesus went round from village to village, appearing as a worshiper in the synagogues, and availing himself of the customary invitation to speak to the people; and "he was glorified of all."¹⁷

We are not told *what* or how much he taught—probably the simple lesson, expounded from the prophets, that "the kingdom of heaven was at hand." How near it was, when he himself was present, was an announcement that he reserved for—or perhaps we should rather say was impelled by the Spirit to make to—the people of his own city. "He came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up."¹⁸ And there, even as he made the first plain announcement of his Messiahship, he encountered the first open opposition, for, as he himself said, "A prophet is not accepted in his own country." Here, as was the custom in all the Galilean synagogues, but doubtless with a more eager expectation, he was invited to read the Scriptures and address the people. It was plainly not without some high purpose that he chose the passage of Isaiah: "*The Spirit of Jehovah is upon me*, because he hath *anointed* me to preach the Gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, and to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind; to set at liberty them that are bruised; to preach the acceptable year of Jehovah"¹⁹—the Jubilee of the world. He closed the book, and returned it to the officer of the synagogue who kept the sacred rolls, and sat down. But all eyes remained fixed upon him in an expectation which he satisfied, rather than surprised, by announcing himself as the *Christ*, who was thus filled with the Spirit, to preach this Gospel:—"This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

At first, the hearers were divided between admiration of the Prophet and offense at his origin, as the son of their humble fellow-townsmen Joseph.²⁰ But when, foreseeing that they would raise the selfish cry for signs and wonders to

¹⁷ Luke iv. 14, 15. ¹⁸ Luke iv. 16-31. ¹⁹ Isaiah lxi 1, 2. ²⁰ Luke iv. 22.

glorify his own city, Jesus intimated that he was sent to the Gentiles—such as the Sidonian widow to whom Elijah ministered, and the Syrian leper whom Elisha healed,⁴¹ the Prophet's own countrymen being passed over in both cases—then their wonder turned to rage. They dragged him out of the city, to cast him from the hill upon which it was built; but he passed unseen from the midst of them, and so escaped.⁴²

§ 11. Jesus next appeared at Capernaum, on the Lake of Galilee.⁴³ His residence at this city, which had already witnessed one of his greatest miracles, and perhaps more, is referred to by himself as having raised the place to heaven in privilege, though its unbelief cast it down to hell.⁴⁴ Meanwhile the place became the centre from which the "great light," predicted by Isaiah, shone round upon "the people that walked in darkness" and "sat in the region and shadow of death."⁴⁵ The tribes of Zabulon and Naphthali, after being seduced into idolatry through their neighborhood to the Phœnicians on the one side, were among the first who succumbed to the attacks of the Assyrians on the other. Having been carried captive by Tiglath-pileser,⁴⁶ their land was repopled in a great degree by a mixture of heathen settlers, and thus the northern part of Galilee acquired both the name and character of "Galilee of the Gentiles."⁴⁷

Our Saviour's chief resort was now the margin of that beautiful lake which is variously called the Sea of Galilee, of Tiberias, and of Gennesareth. "He walked by the Sea of Galilee," not like the pilgrim who now tracks his footsteps—

"Where stately Jordan flows by many a palm,
Or where Gennesaret's wave
Delights the flowers to lave,
That o'er her western slope breathe airs of balm.

"All through the summer night,
Those blossoms red and bright⁴⁸
Spread their soft breasts, unheeding, to the breeze,
Like hermits watching still
Around the sacred hill
Where erst our Saviour watched upon his knees.

⁴¹ Luke iv. 23-28.

⁴² Luke iv. 28-31. ⁴³ Luke iv. 31.

⁴⁴ Matt. xi. 25.

⁴⁵ Matt. iv. 13-16: comp. Is. ix. 1, 2.

⁴⁶ See *O. T. History*, chap. xxiv. § 8.

⁴⁷ See further in *Notes and Illustrations* (C), GALILEE.

⁴⁸ Oleanders (not rhododendrons), with which the western bank of the lake is said to be clothed down to the water's edge.

"The Paschal moon above
 Seems like a saint to rove,
 Left shining in the world with Christ alone;
 Below, the lake's still face
 Sleeps sweetly in th' embrace
 Of mountains terrac'd high with mossy stone.

"Here may we sit, and dream
 Over the heavenly theme,
 Till to our soul the former days return;
 Till on the grassy bed,
 Where thousands once He fed,
 The world's incarnate Maker we discern."⁴⁰

The region of beauty, thus mused over by the poet, was to Him the scene of constant labor for the souls that sat there in darkness. Days begun in preaching were filled up with the relief of hundreds who were sick, maimed, or tormented with devils; and the ensuing nights were spent in lonely agonies of prayer, or in crossing over the stormy lake. Here Christ is first presented to our view as preaching the Word of God to such multitudes, that he was fain to seek a station whence to address them on the lake itself. Two fishing-boats were drawn up on the beach, while their owners were employed in washing their nets. Jesus entered one of them, which was Simon's, as St. Luke simply tells us, without any allusion to his previous call.⁴¹ After teaching the people from a short distance off the coast, Christ bade Simon and his brother Andrew to put out into deep water, and to let down their nets. Now appears the first mark of recognition:—"Master," says Simon, "we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless, *at thy word*, I will let down the net."⁴² The cast was followed by such a haul of fish, that the net broke; they called for help to their partners, the owners of the other ship, who were no other than John the son of Zebedee, and his brother James; and the fish so loaded both the ships, that they began to sink. Overcome by these wonders, Peter fell down upon his knees, saying, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," thus, by direct prayer to Christ, with

⁴⁰ Keble, *Christian Year*: "Third Sunday in Advent."—"The Sea of Galilee is of an oval shape, about 13 geographical miles long, and 6 broad. The river Jordan enters it at its northern end, and passes out at its southern end. In fact the bed of the lake is just a lower section of the great Jordan valley. Its most re-

markable feature is its deep depression, its surface being no less than 700 feet below the level of the ocean. Like almost all lakes of volcanic origin, it occupies the bottom of a great basin, the sides of which shelve down with a uniform slope from the surrounding plateaus.

⁴¹ Luke v. 1-3.

⁴² Luke v. 5.

confession of sin, recognizing for the first time his true divinity."²

What John records was not yet a call to constant attendance on the Master and the ministry of the Word, though enough had passed to designate these first disciples for their future ministry, especially when they baptized Christ's converts, and when he spoke to them of their part in the coming spiritual harvest. Their return to their homes and their callings was an act of duty, and it gave them besides the opportunity of preparing for their final call in that gradual manner which usually marks God's own processes. We see them diligently employed in hard and often fruitless work, and the two of them, who are able to employ hired servants, sharing their father's labors with filial piety. That, amid their worldly business, they may have somewhat forgotten their higher calling, is in accordance with human nature, and seems almost implied in their occupation about their nets while Jesus was preaching on the shore. With his own exquisite gentleness he recalls them to himself, first by using Peter's boat to address the people from, and then by repaying its use with a generosity which was nevertheless eclipsed by the miracle it involved. So Peter falls down, not to thank the giver for the fish, but to glorify the Lord by a confession that proved himself to be now prepared for the work to which he is forthwith called:—"Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men."³ The interpretation of this figure was made by Christ himself, when he compared the kingdom of heaven to a net cast into the sea; and the lesson was repeated in his last interview with his disciples on the Lake of Galilee, when the fact that, with another miraculous draught of fishes, "*the net did not break*," intimated that the time was at length come to reward the spiritual labors of these "fishers of men."⁴

Meanwhile they left all, fish, nets, and ship, to become the constant followers of Christ; and the same course was taken by their partners, James and John, who had returned to the shore, and were busy with their father Zebedee, mending their broken nets, when Jesus called them in the words he had used to Peter and Andrew. It is a fine touch in St. Mark's narrative, that their father was not left uncared for: "They left their father Zebedee in the ship with the hired servants."⁵

Throughout this whole narrative we have assumed that the

² Luke v. 8.

³ Lit., take them alive, *ἔσθ' ζῶντων*. | Mark i. 16-20.

⁴ John xxi. 1-11.

⁵ Luke v. 10-11; Matt. iv. 18-22;

fuller account of Luke relates to the same events as the briefer story of Matthew and Mark. Those who take a different view are not agreed as to which call should be the earlier; and, as to difficulties arising from minor discrepancies, they may be once for all disposed of by the following arguments, which are conclusive in this and many similar cases:—"That there are some difficulties, yet such as hardly deserve that name, in the bringing to a perfect agreement of the two accounts, every one will readily admit; but, wherever these occur, the taking refuge at once in the supposition that an event happened, with immaterial variations, twice or even three times over, seems a very questionable untying of the knot. . . . Very often a far more real difficulty is thus created. . . . Any one who considers the various aspects, yet all true, in which the same event will present itself from different points of view to different witnesses,—who keeps in mind how very few points in any complex fact or event any narration whatever can seize,—least of all a written one, which in its very nature is limited,—will little wonder when two or three relators have in part seized diversely the culminating points of a narrative,—have brought out different moments of an event. He will rather be grateful to that providence of God, which thus often sets us not merely in the place of one by-stander, but of many; allows us to see the acts of Christ, every side of which is significant, from various points of view, to hear, of his discourses, not merely so much as one disciple took in and carried away, but also that which sank especially deep into the heart and memory of another."⁶⁶

§ 12. The following Sabbath was a memorable day at Capernaum.⁶⁷ In the midst of the synagogue, where Jesus appeared according to his custom, exciting new astonishment by the power of his teaching, there was one of those unhappy wretches called *Demoniacs*. The state of such persons has been a most fruitful topic of controversy; but one thing is quite clear, that its reality can not be denied or explained away, without impugning the whole truth of the Gospels. For they most clearly assume the personal presence of evil spirits in the possessed man, overpowering his will and governing his actions. The unclean spirits are said to "enter in" and "depart out of" the patients. They speak and are spoken to, both while within their victims and after they have come out. They hold converse with Christ in a manner quite unsuitable to the sufferers, but just on the terms we should expect from

⁶⁶ Trench, *On the Miracles*, iii. p. 125. ⁶⁷ Mark i. 21-28; Luke iv. 31-37.

fallen spirits, still in rebellion against his authority, which yet they are compelled to own. He fixes their very place of abode, after they have left the bodies of their victims. In the face of all these statements, to explain away possession as epilepsy, or lunacy, is to accuse our Saviour and the Evangelists of a delusion or imposture (and it could scarcely have been the former) as gross as that of the modern "spiritualists." In some cases, bodily or mental disease may have co-existed with the possession, which is therefore classed with sicknesses, while at the same time distinguished from lunacy," a distinction which was clearly drawn by the Jews themselves." Nor can it be said that Jesus simply used the *name* that had first been established by an erroneous belief, just as we keep the word *lunacy*. What should we think of a physician, who so used that word as to imply his belief in the thing? who should describe the cure of his patients as the moon ceasing to afflict them? nay, who should solemnly address the moon, and, with the authority of its Creator, bid it leave off hurting the patient? We do not affect to explain the state itself; nor need sceptical philosophers complain of this, till they have explained mental derangement. The limits and mutual reactions of the spiritual, mental, and corporeal faculties in man have as yet baffled all the researches of science. It is enough that we can see in this condition a consequence of the doctrine of a usurped kingdom of evil in the world, under a personal head (διάβολος) with many followers and ministers (δαίμονες, δαιμόνια) who exercise power over fallen man."

"Jesus went about healing all that were oppressed of the devil." In his own temptation he had sternly rebuked Satan's attempt to make him a subject, and now he proved his right to the kingdom by his unbounded power over evil spirits, who confess their own defeat. Nay, even before he exerts his power, they anticipate their doom. They know that that doom is certain, that "their time is short," and that he is both the divine "Lord of Angels" (the Archangel), alike of the holy and the fallen, and "the seed of the woman" who was to "bruise the serpent's head." So, while he taught in the synagogue at Capernaum, the devil cried out, in surprise and terror, "Ha!" What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy us?"—as on other oc-

⁶⁰ Mark i. 34; Matt. iv. 24.

⁶⁰ Matt. ix. 32, and xii. 22, compared with Mark vii. 32.

⁶⁰ Acts v. 3; John xiii. 2: comp. 1 John iii. 8, John viii. 44.

⁶¹ "Εα, which our version renders as an imperative "Let us alone!"

casions, "Art thou come to torment us *before the time?*"⁶² But he adds, "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God;" and this is one of the most remarkable points in our Lord's dealings with the evil spirits, the testimony they bear to him. Hell is before Earth in acknowledging her Lord. Fear has a quicker perception than Love, or even than the sense of need. "The devils also believe and tremble." This confession has been regarded by some as an involuntary utterance of truth or as an act of abject fawning, and by others as an unwilling testimony extorted by the power of Christ. But the fact that he rejects it concurs with other considerations in suggesting that its real motive was malicious. His acknowledgment by the devils seems to be closely connected with the accusation of the Jews:—"He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils."⁶³ But while their confession proved that he was their master, he will not accept their testimony to his spiritual character and mission. He, who had other and greater witness even than John the Baptist, will not use *their* utterances to reveal what is revealed by his own word. So on this, and all similar occasions, he silences, we may say muzzles, the evil spirit, who takes a parting revenge by doing all the harm he could to the man's body, as he had tried to do to our Saviour's reputation. But the same power that cast him out, at once healed the body he had mangled.⁶⁴ This example of our Saviour's power over the spiritual world was all the more striking by its contrast to those attempts at exorcism by which the Jews did little more than admit their belief in the reality of possession, and prove the fallacy of their charge against Christ, that his real exorcisms proved him to be in league with evil spirits. The fame of his decisive victory over Satan spread through all the neighboring parts of Galilee.⁶⁵

From the synagogue, Christ went to the house of Peter, and healed his wife's mother, who was sick of a fever. The fact of Peter's marriage, which thus comes out incidentally, is alluded to by St. Paul as an argument for his own liberty to marry if he had only thought it expedient. This is one of the many cases, in which the facts recorded in Scripture seem specially designed to anticipate the errors of later ages. This

⁶² Matt. viii. 29.

⁶³ Mark iii. 11, 22: comp. Acts xvi. 16-18.

⁶⁴ This is the plain and easy reconciliation of Mark's "when the unclean spirit had torn him," with

Luke's "he hurt him not." As to the "loud cry," comp. Acts viii. 7.

⁶⁵ Mark i. 21-28; Luke iv. 31, 37.

The silence of Matthew seems to indicate that the worldly-minded publican was not present in the synagogue.

great Sabbath of "doing good" was closed by an evening no less memorable. As soon as the sun had set, the people, who had scrupled to carry the sick to Christ before the Sabbath ended, brought all in the town who were suffering from every form of disease, and among them many demoniacs; and Jesus healed them all, again imposing silence on the evil spirits, when they proclaimed him as the Christ. Thus did he show himself in the character foretold by Isaiah:—"Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses."⁶⁶ The memorable Sabbath, the events of which are thus circumstantially recorded, may give us an example of our Lord's labors in his ministry, and show us how he fulfilled his own great saying concerning doing good on the Sabbath days:—"My Father worketh hitherto, *and I work.*"

§ 13. The next morning shows us another aspect of our Saviour's character. Instead of indolent repose after such a day of labor, he rose up long before the dawn, and went into a solitary place to pray. Besides the impressive example of *early rising and prayer*,⁶⁷ we see in this retirement, as in many other cases, the desire to withdraw himself out of the danger of a precipitate demonstration of premature zeal. Accordingly, when his disciples found him, he at once proposed to leave Capernaum for a time, and preach the Gospel in the surrounding cities. So he went throughout all Galilee, teaching in the synagogues and healing the sick and possessed. But it was not Galilee alone that reaped the benefit. The fame of his teaching and his miracles drew multitudes from the neighboring parts of Syria, from the whole of Decapolis, and the region beyond the Jordan and the lake, and even from Jerusalem and Judæa.⁶⁸

This was *Christ's First Circuit through Galilee*. Its course is conjectured by Gresswell to have been, upon the whole, as follows:—"First, along the western side of the Jordan, northward, which would disseminate the fame of Jesus in Decapolis; secondly, along the confines of the tetrarchy of Philip, westward, which would make him known throughout Syria; thirdly, by the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, southward; and, lastly, along the verge of Samaria, and the western region of the Lake of Galilee—the nearest points to Judæa proper and to Peræa—until it returned to Capernaum."⁶⁹ Such a circuit


⁶⁶ Matt. viii. 4-17; Mark i. 29-34; Luke iv. 38-41; Is. liii. 4.

⁶⁷ See Henry Vaughan's beautiful lines with this title, in several collections of English poetry.

⁶⁸ Matt. iv. 23-25; Mark i. 35-39; Luke iv. 42-44.

⁶⁹ Gresswell, *Dissertations*, vol. ii. p. 293.

must have occupied some months; but perhaps it is needlessly enlarged, in order to bring Jesus near the parts from which his followers came. It would rather seem, notwithstanding the indefinite phrase, "all Galilee," that this first circuit had a narrower scope.⁷⁰ After the man cured of leprosy had spread his fame abroad,⁷¹ he avoided such great publicity by retiring into the desert; and it was *there* that "they came to him from every quarter." Nor do the meagre details of this circuit seem consistent with a great extent or a long duration. Its only recorded incident is the miracle just referred to, by which Christ showed his power over a disease incurable in its virulence, and excluding the sufferer from the society of his fellows as well as the ordinances of religion; one which, for all these reasons, has ever been considered a type of inveterate sin. In healing the leper by a *touch*, our Saviour not only showed his power but claimed a right that belonged only to



Map of Galilee.

⁷⁰ See Mark i. 38.⁷¹ See below.

the priest, and asserted his own exemption from ceremonial defilement."¹² In saying "I will, be thou clean," he assumed a still higher prerogative, and pointed to a more thorough purification of the whole nature; while, in sending the man to the priest, and bidding him offer the sacrifice appointed by Moses, he at once showed his own reverence for the law, and made his very enemies witnesses to the cure. The scene of this miracle was "a certain city," the name of which is not mentioned, but which seems to have been Christ's abode for some time. But, in consequence of the multitudes who were attracted by the fame of the miracle, which the healed leper "blazed abroad" contrary to our Lord's injunction, he withdrew into the wilderness, and perhaps we may see in this circumstance a premature termination of the circuit. St. Mark alone gives any hint of its duration by the indefinite phrase, that Christ returned to Capernaum "after [some] days."

§ 14. The return of Jesus to Capernaum was followed by one of the most important incidents of his ministry. We have seen that followers flocked to him even from Jerusalem and Judæa. Among these, as well as from the cities of Galilee, there were many Pharisees and teachers of the law, who came to watch him. In their presence, Jesus performed his great miracle of curing the bedridden paralytic; but not till he had first said to him, "Thy sins be forgiven thee!" The Jews saw the full extent of the prerogative thus claimed. Malignant as was their spirit, in charging him with blasphemy, their reasoning was perfectly right:—"Who can forgive sins, but *God alone?*" And even before replying, Christ proved his divine knowledge by discerning in their hearts the objection which horror suspended on their tongues. Then he makes good his claim by words as well as deeds. The force of his argument is often lost by overlooking the proper emphasis, "Which is easier, to *say*, Thy sins be forgiven thee, or to *say*, Rise up and walk?" The mere *word* proves nothing in either case; but when the *act* followed upon the latter command, it proved the power that attended the former. The helpless patient, rising up at the word of

¹² Matt. viii. 2-4; Mark i. 40-45; Luke v. 12-16: comp. Lev. xiii., xiv., Num. v. 2, 3. With regard to the order of St. Matthew, it is to be observed that he evidently places the Sermon on the Mount as early as possible, as the great epitome of our Lord's teaching, prefixing to it only those events which could not possibly be put out of their proper order. After it he relates, without regard to chronological sequence, the chief events of our Lord's earlier ministry in Galilee (c. viii., ix.), which Mark and Luke refer to their proper places.

Christ, and carrying his bed to his own house; was a living proof that He who had dared also to utter to him the words of absolution had really "power upon earth to forgive sins." The force of the argument was at once felt by the people, who saw brought to their own doors a power which was the prerogative of the God of heaven; and "they glorified him, who had given such a power to man." The Pharisees and Doctors would carry back to Jerusalem the news that Jesus of Nazareth had now openly proclaimed his kingdom over the most sacred domain of man's spiritual life, as a sinner seeking forgiveness from his offended God."

§ 15. The call of Levi or MATTHEW, also at Capernaum, from the very booth where as a publican (*portitor*) he was collecting taxes, is placed by Mark and Luke directly after the healing of the paralytic; and there seems no sufficient reason for separating from it the feast given by Matthew, at which the presence of many publicans and sinners gave our Lord occasion to teach the offended Pharisees, that he had not come to call the righteous—those who fancied themselves such—but sinners, to repentance." At the same banquet Jesus answered the charge made against his disciples for not fasting, and taught, by the parable of the new wine in old

⁷³ Matt. ix. 2-8; Mark ii. 1-12; Luke v. 17-26. Various explanations have been given of the means to which the earnest faith of the bearers of the paralytic prompted them, in order to gain access to Christ, when they found it impossible to make their way through the crowd that blocked up the entrance to the inner court of the house. Around part, if not the whole of the court of an Eastern house, is a verandah, often 9 or 10 feet deep, over which, when there is more than one floor, runs a second gallery of like depth, with a balustrade. Bearing in mind that the reception-room is raised above the level of the court, we may suppose either (1) that our Lord was standing under the verandah, and the people in front in the court. The bearers of the sick man ascended the stairs to the roof of the house, and taking off a portion of the boarded covering of the verandah, or removing the awning over the impluvium, τὸ μέσον, in the former

case let down the bed *through* the verandah roof, or in the latter, *down by way of* the roof, διὰ τῶν κεράμων, and deposited it before the Saviour. (2) Another explanation presents itself in considering the room where the company were assembled as the ὑπερῶον, and the roof opened for the bed to be the true roof of the house (Trench, *Miracles*, 199). (3) And one still more simple is found in regarding the house as one of the rude dwellings still to be seen near the Sea of Galilee, a mere room "10 or 12 feet high, and as many or more square," with no opening except the door. The roof, used as a sleeping-place, is reached by a ladder from the outside; and the bearers of the paralytic, unable to approach the door, would thus have ascended the roof, and having uncovered it (ἐξορύξαντες), let him down into the room where our Lord was.

⁷⁴ Matt. ix. 9-14; Mark ii. 15-17; Luke v. 27-32.

bottles, and the new cloth sewn into an old garment, the impossibility of confining the spiritual power of his kingdom within the dead letter of forms and traditions."⁶ If, following the order of Matthew, we place after this the cure of the woman with an issue of blood, the restoration to life of the daughter of Jairus, the giving of sight to two blind men, and the casting a devil out of a dumb man,"⁷ we have, in this first stage of our Lord's Galilean ministry, examples of nearly all his chief miracles. In each species of miracle we may trace some particular infirmity, the fruit and type of a marked sin, not necessarily in the individual sufferer, but in human nature. *Disease*, in general, is the result of sin, and the type of moral disorder; the *demoniac*, of *passion*; the *leper*, of *pollution*; the *paralytic*, of helpless *prostration*; the loss of *sight*, and *speech*, and *hearing*, are emblems of the loss of spiritual sense by the willful shutting out of spiritual objects; and the whole train of evils is crowned by *death*, the wages of sin. Nor, in considering the various forms of our Lord's miracles, should we fail to notice the varied exhibitions of faith in those who came to him for relief; for it was in exciting and rewarding such faith that the moral power of his miracles was chiefly shown.

Thus, in the course of a year, had Jesus, after giving the Jews assembled at the Passover the first great opportunity which they lost, gathered in the first-fruits of spiritual harvest from the rejected soil of Samaria, and revealed the light of the Gospel amid the darkness of Galilee of the Gentiles, when according to the most probable interpretation of John v. 1, the return of the Passover called him up for the second time to Jerusalem.

§ 16. "After this there was a feast of the Jews, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem."⁸ The chronological difficulty involved in this passage is discussed elsewhere;⁹ and though the question seems incapable of absolute settlement, we may adopt the probability, that the "Feast" was the Passover (A.D. 28), as furnishing a definite, though not quite certain, order for the narrative. But the difficulty does not at all affect the importance of the ensuing transactions at Jerusalem, as giving occasion for the first of our Saviour's great discourses, in controversy with the unbelieving Jews. In such discourses we first see the great principle, afterward so con-

⁶ Matt. ix. 15-17; Mark ii. 18-22; Luke v. 33-39.

⁷ Matt. ix. 18-34; Mark v. 22-43; Luke viii. 41-56. ⁷⁷ John v. 1.

⁷⁸ See *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

spicuous in the history of the Church, that controversy is called forth by opposition and heresy, and then by controversy doctrine is established. And the office of recording this aspect of our Lord's ministry fell to John, not only as his most constant companion and the most intimate sharer of his thoughts, but as the apostle who survived till the heresies, which are more than once glanced at in the New Testament, had acquired such force as to be thus rebuked. The occasion was the miracle which Christ wrought on the palsied cripple at the pool which was fitly called BETHESDA (*the house of mercy*), which was near the sheep-gate on the north-east side of the Temple.⁷⁹ It is said that the waters of this tank were connected with those of the pool of Siloam by subterraneous channels, through which there were sudden flushes that made the water bubble up in commotion.⁸⁰ At such seasons the water was supposed to have healing virtues; confined, however, to the first who stepped down into the tank, round which porticoes were built, to shelter the multitudes of sick and cripples, who came to take their chance. The doubts that have been cast upon the prodigy do not in the least detract from the use made of it by Christ.⁸¹ On the contrary, the supposition of its being a delusion sets the truth of his miracle in a more striking light, as being the reality of that power which was there vainly sought. In any case, the miracle itself displayed the power, which Jesus claimed in the subsequent discourse, of exercising authority both over the laws of nature and the positive institutions of religion. The case chosen by our Lord was among the most hopeless of all that lay in the House of Mercy. The cripple had been paralyzed for thirty-eight years, the very period that his forefathers had wandered in the wilderness; and the burden of his infirmities was aggravated by the consciousness that they were the natural reward of his sins.⁸² Thus he was a fit type of the people, in whom Jesus fulfilled the words of Isaiah, "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses." Jesus healed him, not by helping him to the waters, nor by any other visible agency, but by the very command to use the powers that had been so long suspended: "Rise, take up thy

⁷⁹ The large reservoir called the *Birket Israil*, within the walls of the city, close by the St. Stephen's gate, and under the north-east wall of the Haram area, is generally considered to be the modern representative of Bethesda.

⁸⁰ Such a movement of water may be seen in a canal lock.

⁸¹ Verse 4, which seems to assert the reality of the miracle, is now regarded as spurious.

⁸² See v. 14.

bed, and walk!" Some commentators see in this act a sort of humiliation for the sin which had prostrated the sufferer. At all events, it involved other important consequences; for the offense which was loudly expressed by the Jews gave occasion to the first of those great doctrinal discourses of our Lord, which form so marked a feature of the Gospel of St. John.

"On the same day was the Sabbath;" and the Jews at once accused the man of Sabbath-breaking. They had, indeed, the letter of the law on their side; for carrying a burden was a "servile work," and this very act had been especially denounced by the prophets.^a But yet the man's simple answer involved a decisive argument:—"He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed and walk." It is the same argument afterward urged on just such another occasion: "How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?"^b

Our Lord himself enforced the argument, in defending himself against the Jews, who would have put him to death as a Sabbath-breaker. Virtually denying their jurisdiction, he asserted his own supremacy over the Sabbath, and by implication over every positive law, by the proof just given of his authority over the laws of nature, and on no less a ground than his own supreme divinity, as equal with the Father:—"My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." These words involve the whole spirit of Christ's teaching in regard to the Sabbath. When God finished his work of creation, his Sabbath rest was not inaction. He works continually, in his providence and his grace, in the work of sustaining his creatures, and especially in restoring them from their fall, and creating them anew to spiritual life. Thus has God "done good" hitherto, throughout the Sabbatic cycle of the ages. In this work, as in the material creation, the Word of God is the partaker and the true agent. So when he was made flesh, he made the same use of his earthly Sabbaths, and employed them in alleviating the burdens of the nature he had assumed. Thus "the Son of Man" was constituted "Lord of the Sabbath." In that character he proclaimed the great principles,—*"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath;"*—"I will have mercy rather than sacrifice;"—and he added the practical law, which once received in its spirit would leave little room for casuistry, *"Wherefore it is lawful"*—not simply *allowable*, as an exception, but *right*,

^a Jer. xvii. 21-24; Neh. xv. 32-33.

^b John ix. 16, 17, 24, 25, 29, 30.

as the very essence of the institution—"It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath days." Not once only, but again and again, he illustrated these principles by such cases as that of the beast of burden fallen into a pit; he acted upon them, both in his ordinary work as a teacher, the highest form of "doing good," and by working miracles especially on this day, and maintained them in repeated arguments against the Jews.

The other assertion involved in our Saviour's words was as clear to the understanding of the Jews as it was hateful to their prejudices. "Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God."⁸⁸ Instead of disowning the inference, our Saviour joins issue upon its truth. Pointing to his works as a proof of the perfect unity of power between his Father and himself, he claims the highest attribute of God, the power to confer spiritual life, and he declares, as a practical appeal to his opponents, that *now* was the season for its exercise. Their indignation at this new blasphemy is met, as on other occasions, by the remonstrance, "Marvel not at this," as the preface to new wonders, for this power to give spiritual life, arising from the divine life which the Son had in himself, would soon be proved by his power to awake the dead, and to call them before his own judgment-seat. For to him alone was committed the divine attribute of judgment, because with him alone were the eternal principles of justice.

The latter part of the discourse relates to the evidence of these claims. The recent testimony of John, added to the teaching of Moses and all the Scriptures, left the Jews without excuse for their unbelief, which Jesus traces back to the depravity of their will. But he appeals to higher testimony still, his own witness of himself, confirmed by the witness of the works which the Father had given him to do. But, in presenting these great truths and this convincing evidence, Jesus addresses the rulers of the Jews, not as disciples to be instructed and convinced, but as enemies to be put to shame by the truth they hated; and to all the other proofs of his omniscience, he adds his knowledge of their ingrained aversion to God's truth.

This discourse may serve as an example of those which oc-

⁸⁸ John v. 18. The inference is that God was his Father, in such a not drawn merely from Christ's call-manner and connection as to imply ing God his Father, but from the his equality with God. whole spirit of his claim. He said,

cupy so large a proportion of the Gospel of St. John, especially the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters. The precise points in controversy, and the illustrations employed by Christ, vary with the several occasions; but in all he appears claiming a dignity and authority no less than divine: in all he convicts the Jews, and especially their rulers, from their own most cherished principles, of obstinate unbelief in rejecting his divine authority. Meanwhile, he had no sooner borne the first of these great testimonies against the Jewish rulers, than he withdrew himself from their plots against his life,⁸⁸ and returned from this Passover, where he had once more experienced and rebuked the unbelief of the Jews, to the scene of his more hopeful labors in Galilee.

⁸⁸ John v. 16.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) SCENE OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY.

MATTHEW, MARK, and LUKE record only our Lord's doings in Galilee; if we put aside a few days before the Passion, we find that they never mention his visiting Jerusalem. John, on the other hand, while he records some acts in Galilee, devotes the chief part of his Gospel to the transactions in Judæa. But when the supplemental character of John's Gospel is borne in mind, there is little difficulty in explaining this. The three Evangelists do not profess to give a chronology of the ministry, but rather a picture of it: notes of time are not frequent in their narrative. And as they chiefly confined themselves to Galilee, where the Redeemer's chief acts were done, they might naturally omit to mention the feasts, which, being passed by our Lord at Jerusalem, added nothing to the materials for his Galilean ministry. John, on the other hand, writing later, and giving an account of the Redeemer's life which is still less complete as a history (for more than one-half of the fourth Gospel is occupied with the last three months of the ministry, and seven chapters out of twenty-one are filled with the account of the few days of the Passion), vindicates his historical claim by supplying several precise notes of time. In the occurrences after the baptism

of Jesus, days and even hours are specified (John i. 29, 35, 39, 43, ii. 1); the first miracle is mentioned, and the time at which it was wrought (John ii. 1-11). He mentions not only the Passover (John ii. 13, 23; vi. 4; xiii. 1, and perhaps v. 1), but also the Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 2) and of Dedication (John x. 22): and thus it is ordered that the Evangelist who goes over the least part of the ground of our Lord's ministry is yet the same who fixes for us its duration, and enables us to arrange the facts of the rest more exactly in their historical places. It is true that the three Gospels record chiefly the occurrences in Galilee; but there is evidence in them that miracles were wrought in Judæa. Frequent teaching in Jerusalem is implied in the Lord's lamentation over the lost city (Matt. xxiii. 37). The appearance in Galilee of Scribes and Pharisees and others from Jerusalem (Matt. iv. 25, xv. 1) would be best explained on the supposition that their enmity had been excited against him during visits to Jerusalem. The intimacy with the family of Lazarus (Luke x. 38), and the attachment of Joseph of Arimathea to the Lord (Matt. xxvii. 57), would imply, most probably, frequent visits to Jerusalem. But why was Galilee chosen as the principal scene of the ministry? The question is not easy to answer. The Prophet would resort to the Temple of God;

the King of the Jews would go to his own royal city; the Teacher of the chosen people would preach in the midst of them. But their hostility prevented it. The Saviour, who, accepting all the infirmities of "the form of a servant," which he had taken, fled in his childhood to Egypt, betakes himself to Galilee to avoid Jewish hatred and machinations, and lays the foundations of his Church amid a people of impure and despised race. (See below, *Note C.*) To Jerusalem he comes occasionally, to teach, and suffer persecution, and finally to die: "for it can not be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem" (Luke xiii. 33). It was upon the first outbreak of persecution against him that he left Judæa: "When Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee" (Matt. iv. 12). And that this persecution aimed at him also we gather from St. John: "When therefore the Lord knew how that the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John . . . he left Judæa and departed into Galilee" (John iv. 1, 3). If the light of the Sun of Righteousness shone on the Jews henceforward from the far-off shores of the Galilean lake, it was because they had refused and abhorred that light.

(B.) DURATION OF OUR LORD'S MINISTRY.

It is impossible to determine exactly from the Gospels the number of years during which the Redeemer exercised his ministry before the Passion; but the doubt lies between two and three; for the opinion, adopted from an interpretation of Isaiah lxi. 2 by more than one of the ancients,

that it lasted only one year, can not be borne out (Euseb. iii. 24; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1; Origen, *Princ.* 4, 5). The data are to be drawn from St. John. This Evangelist mentions six feasts, at five of which Jesus was present; the Passover that followed his baptism (John ii. 13); "a feast of the Jews" (*ἑορτή* without the article, John v. 1); a Passover during which Jesus remained in Galilee (John vi. 4); the Feast of Tabernacles to which the Lord went up privately (John vii. 2); the Feast of Dedication (John x. 22); and lastly the Feast of Passover, at which he suffered (John xii., xiii.). There are certainly three Passovers, and it is possible that "a feast" (John v. 1) may be a fourth. Upon this possibility the question turns. Lücke in his Commentary (vol. ii. p. 1), in collecting with great research the various opinions on this point, is unable to arrive at any definite conclusion upon it, and leaves it unsolved. But if this feast is not a Passover, then no Passover is mentioned by John between the first (John ii. 13) and that which is spoken of in the sixth chapter; and the time between those two must be assumed to be a single year only. Now, although the record of John of this period contains but few facts, yet when all the Evangelists are compared, the amount of labor compressed into this single year would be too much for its compass. The time during which Jesus was baptizing (by his disciples) near the Jordan was probably considerable, and lasted till John's imprisonment (John iii. 22-36). The circuit round Galilee (Matt. iv. 23-25) was a missionary journey through a country of considerable population, and containing two hundred towns; and this would occupy some time. But another such

journey, of the most comprehensive kind, is undertaken in the same year (Luke viii. 1), in which he "went throughout every city and village." And a third circuit of the same kind, and equally general (Matt. ix. 35-38), would close the same year. Is it at all probable that Jesus, after spending a considerable time in Judæa, would be able to make three circuits of Galilee in the remainder of the year, preaching and doing wonders in the various places to which he came? This would be more likely if the journeys were hurried and partial; but all three are spoken of as though they were the very opposite. It is, to say the least, easier to suppose that the "feast" (John v. 1) was a Passover, dividing the time into two, and throwing two of these circuits into the second year of the ministry; provided there be nothing to make this interpretation improbable in itself. The words are, "After this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem." These two facts are meant as cause and effect; the feast caused the visit. If so, it was probably one of the three feasts at which the Jews were expected to appear before God at Jerusalem.* Was it the Passover, the Pentecost, or the Feast of Tabernacles? In the preceding chapter the Passover has been spoken of as "the feast" (ver. 45); and if another feast were meant here the name of it would have been added, as in vii. 2, x. 22. The omission of the article is not decisive, for it occurs in other cases where the Passover is certainly intended (Matt. xxvii. 15; Mark xv. 6); nor is it clear that the Passover was called *the* feast, as the

* This is an argument against the somewhat arbitrary hypothesis that it was the Feast of Purim.

most eminent, although the Feast of Tabernacles was sometimes so described. All that the omission could prove would be that the Evangelist did not think it needful to describe the feast more precisely. The words in John iv. 35, "There are yet four months and then cometh harvest," would agree with this, for the barley-harvest began on the 16th Nisan, and reckoning back four months would bring this conversation to the beginning of December, *i. e.*, the middle of Kislev. If it be granted that our Lord is here merely quoting a common form of speech (Alford), still it is more likely that he would use one appropriate to the time at which he was speaking. And if these words were uttered in December, the next of the three great feasts occurring would be the Passover. The shortness of the interval between v. 1 and vi. 4 would afford an objection, if it were not for the scantiness of historical details in the early part of the ministry in St. John: from the other Evangelists it appears that two great journeys might have to be included between these verses. Upon the whole, though there is nothing that amounts to proof, it is probable that there were four Passovers, and consequently that our Lord's ministry lasted somewhat more than three years, the "beginning of miracles" (John ii.) having been wrought before the first Passover. On data of calculation that have already been mentioned (p. 202), the year of the first of these Passovers was A.U.C. 780 (A.D. 27), and the baptism of our Lord took place either in the beginning of that year or the end of the year preceding. The ministry of John the Baptist began in A.U.C. 779 (A.D. 26).


(C.) GALILEE.

This name, which in the Roman age was applied to a large province, seems to have been originally confined to a little "circuit" (the Hebrew word *Galil*, the origin of the later "Galilee," signifies a "circle, or circuit") of country round Kedesh-Naphtali, in which were situated the twenty towns given by Solomon to Hiram, king of Tyre, as payment for his work in conveying timber from Lebanon to Jerusalem (Josh. xx. 7; 1 K. ix. 11; LXX. *Γαλιλαία*). They were then, or subsequently, occupied by strangers, and for this reason Isaiah gives to the district the name "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Is. ix. 1. In Matt. iv. 15, *Γαλιλαία τῶν ἔθνῶν*; in 1 Macc. v. 15, *Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων*). It is probable that the strangers increased in number, and became during the Captivity the great body of the inhabitants; extending themselves also over the surrounding country, they gave to their new territories the old name, until at length Galilee became one of the largest provinces of Palestine. In the time of the Maccabees Galilee contained only a few Jews living in the midst of a large heathen population (1 Macc. v. 20-23). Strabo states that in his day it was chiefly inhabited by Syrians, Phœnicians, and Arabs (xvi. p. 760); and Josephus says that Greeks also dwelt in its cities (*Vit.* 12.)

In the time of our Lord all Palestine was divided into three provinces, Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee (Acts ix. 31; Luke xvii. 11; Joseph. *B. J.* iii. 8). The latter included the whole

northern section of the country, namely, the ancient territories of Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali. It was divided into two sections, "Lower" and "Upper;" ἡ κάτω καὶ ἡ ἄνω *Γαλιλαία*. A single glance at the country shows that the division was natural. *Lower Galilee* included the great plain of Esdraelon with its offshoots, which run down to the Jordan and the Lake of Tiberias, and the whole of the hill-country adjoining it on the north, to the foot of the mountain-range. *Upper Galilee* embraced the whole mountain-range lying between the upper Jordan and Phœnicia. To this region the name "Galilee of the Gentiles" is given in the O. and N. T. (Is. ix. 1; Matt. iv. 15). The town of Capernaum, on the north shore of the lake, was in Upper Galilee; and this fact is important, as showing how far the province extended southward, and as proving that it, as well as Lower Galilee, touched the lake.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, Galilee became the chief seat of Jewish schools of learning, and the residence of their most celebrated Rabbins. The National Council, or Sanhedrim, was taken for a time to Jabneh in Philistia, but was soon removed to Sepphoris, and afterward to Tiberias. The *Mishna* was here compiled by Rabbi Judah Hakkodesh (cir. A.D. 109-220); and a few years afterward the *Gemara* was added. Remains of splendid synagogues still exist in many of the old towns and villages, showing that from the second to the seventh-century the Jews were as prosperous as they were numerous.



Sliden.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SEQUEL OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY IN GALILEE, FROM AFTER HIS SECOND PASSOVER, IN A.D. 28, TO NEAR THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES, A.D. 29.

- § 1. Return of Jesus from Jerusalem to Galilee—The plucking of the ears of corn on the Sabbath—The healing of the withered hand—Christ rebuts the charge of Sabbath-breaking—Plot of the Pharisees and the Herodians against him. § 2. He retires to the shore of the Galilean lake, and is followed by multitudes—His miracles prove him the servant of God predicted by Isaiah. § 3. Preparations for organizing the Christian Church—Choice of the Twelve Apostles—The Sermon on the Mount—Certain preliminary questions discussed—Unity of the Discourse, and its identity in Matthew and Luke. § 4. The Time and Scene—Mount of the Beatitudes—Choice of the Apostles—Characters of their office—Personal qualifications—The Lists of the Twelve Apostles. § 5. The SERMON ON THE MOUNT; the Law of the New Dispensation. § 6. Effect of the discourse—Jesus returns to Capernaum—Healing of the Centurion's servant—Raising of the widow's son to life. § 7. Last mention of John the Baptist—His message to Jesus—Christ's final testimony to John—Denunciation of the Galilean cities—Thanksgiving for that the Gospel is revealed to babes. § 8. Jesus, at a Pharisee's table, is anointed by a sinful woman—He forgives her sins, and rebukes the scornful Pharisees—The woman not Mary Magdalene—Distinction between this anointing of Jesus as the Christ, and his anointing for his burial by Mary of Bethany. § 9. *Second Circuit through Galilee*—The women who ministered to Jesus—His Miracles, Discourses, and Parables—He stills the Storm on the Lake of Galilee—The Gadarene demoniac. § 10. *Third Circuit through*

Galilee—The Apostles sent forth—Their commission and success. § 11. Herod believes Jesus to be John restored to life, and desires to see him—Jesus retires by ship to a lonely spot on the lake, and is followed by multitudes. § 12. Approach of the Passover, to which Jesus does not go—First miracle of the loaves and fishes—Its effect on the Galileans—They wish to make Jesus king—Voyage of the disciples across the lake—Jesus walks upon the water, and saves Peter—The ensuing controversy—Many desert Jesus—Peter's confession. § 13. Jesus watched by emissaries from Jerusalem—He retires into Phœnicia and Decapolis—The Syro-Phœnician woman—Healing of the deaf and dumb—Second miracle of the loaves and fishes—Encounters with the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians—The sign of the prophet Jonah. § 14. Jesus ascends the Upper Jordan to Cæsarea Philippi—Peter's full confession of the Christ—The Rock on which Christ's Church is built; and the Keys of the kingdom of heaven—Christ predicts his Passion, and rebukes the remonstrance of Peter. § 15. Christ's Transfiguration—Discourse concerning Elias—The demoniac Child—Prayer and Fasting—Renewed prediction of Christ's Passion. § 16. His last return to Capernaum—The contest for precedence—Example of the little child; and the ensuing discourse—Christ's final departure from Galilee.

§ 1. ONCE more we behold Jesus returning from the city of his father David, where he had proved himself the promised spiritual king, rejected and persecuted with a spite that was literally deadly. Though his retirement from Jerusalem removed him beyond the immediate danger that the rulers might have found means to take his life, either in a tumult or by persuading the Roman procurator, he was still pursued by their hostility. During this second period of his Galilean ministry, we often see how closely he was watched by the emissaries of the Jewish rulers. On his very journey he was followed by the same charge which had formed their pretext for plotting against his life at Jerusalem. The innocent act of his hungry disciples, which was sanctioned by a merciful law,¹ of plucking and eating the ripe ears, as they walked through the corn-fields on the Sabbath, was construed into Sabbath-breaking.² At least, the view that the Feast of John v. was a Passover, compared with the order of the other Evangelists, may justify us in regarding the controversy that arose out of the act of the disciples as having occurred on the way back from Jerusalem to Galilee. At all events, the fact of the corn being ripe points to the time of the Passover; though it would depend on the species of the grain, whether this was immediately before the Passover, when the

¹ Dent. xxiii. 25. The disciples must have been living a hard and poor life, to resort to such means of sustenance.

² Some think that the subtle cas-

nistry of the Jewish doctors found the sin in the *manual act* of rubbing the ears of corn in the hands, as a species of that servile labor which was forbidden by the Law.

barley-harvest began, or later, when the wheat was ripe. With this question another is connected, concerning the phrase "the second-first Sabbath,"³ of which the most probable interpretation is that of Wieseler, that it was the "first Sabbath of the second year after the Sabbatic year."⁴

In reply to the charge of Sabbath-breaking made by the Pharisees against the disciples, Jesus reminds them that David, whose example they are not likely to challenge, ate the sacred shew-bread in the tabernacle, which it was not lawful to eat. The priests might partake of it, but not a stranger.⁵ David, on the principle that mercy was better than sacrifice,⁶ took it and gave it to the young men that were with him that they might not perish for hunger. In order further to show that a literal mechanical observance of the law of the Sabbath would lead to absurdities, Jesus reminds them that this law is perpetually set aside on account of another: "The priests profane the Sabbath and are blameless."⁷ The work of sacrifice, the placing of the shew-bread, go on upon the Sabbath, and *labor* even on that day may be done by priests, and may please God. It was the root of the Pharisees' fault that they thought sacrifice better than mercy, ritual exactness more than love: "If ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day."⁸ These last words are inseparable from the meaning of our Lord's answer. In pleading the example of David, the king and prophet, and of the priests in the temple, the Lord tacitly implies the greatness of his own position. He is indeed Prophet, Priest, and King; and had he been none of these, the argument would have been not merely incomplete, but misleading. It is undeniable that the law of the Sabbath was very strict. Against labors as small as that of winnowing the corn a severe penalty was set. Our Lord quotes cases where the law is superseded or set aside, because he is One who has power to do the same. And the rise of a new law is implied in those words which St. Mark alone has recorded: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." The law upon the Sabbath was made in love to men, to preserve for them a due measure of rest, to keep room for the worship of God.* The Son of Man has power to

³ Σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον.

⁴ Matt. xii. 1-8; Mark ii. 23-28; Luke vi. 1-11. Others explain it as the first Sabbath after the second day of the Passover.

⁵ Ex. xxix. 33; Lev. xxiv. 5, 9.

⁶ Hos. vi. 6.

⁷ Matt. xii. 5.

⁸ Matt. xii. 7, 8.

re-adjust this law, if its work is done, or if men are fit to receive a higher.*

The lesson then given was repeated on the following Sabbath, when Christ healed a man with a withered hand in the synagogue, (probably at Capernaum), and silenced the Jews, who were watching to see if he would perform the miracle, by the argument applied by themselves in their own affairs, that it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath days. The application to their consciences was all the keener, as, while he was doing good and saving life, they were doing evil and seeking to destroy his; and, stung to madness by his discernment of their secret thoughts, they began to plot against him with the adherents of Herod Antipas, the political party called Herodians,¹⁰ thus endangering his security even in Galilee.

§ 2. Upon this, Jesus withdrew to some retired spot on the shores of the lake of Galilee; but even here he was followed by a multitude from all parts of the Holy Land, and even beyond its borders, from Idumæa on the south, to Tyre and Sidon on the north. As they thronged the shores of the lake, Jesus addressed them from a small vessel, which he desired his disciples to provide. He healed their diseases and cast out unclean spirits, charging both the patients and the demons not to make him known. In these acts of mercy, extended to many who were aliens to the commonwealth of Israel, and yet withdrawn so carefully from all public parade, Matthew sees the fulfillment of Isaiah's great prophecy of the Messiah as the merciful judge of Gentiles as well as Jews:—the chosen and beloved servant of God, yet so meek that he would not strive or cry for his rights, nor lift up the voice of self-assertion among the haunts of men;—so merciful that he would not break the bruised reed as useless, nor quench the smoking lamp-wick as hopeless; and yet so powerful, by this very might of gentleness, that his just judgments should finally be crowned with universal victory, and his name command the faith of all the nations.¹¹

§ 3. In this assembly on the shores of the lake of Galilee, we see at length all the elements of the visible Church of Christ separated from the world; and, if among those who had followed him into these solitudes, there were secret unbelievers, or opponents, or even traitors, we need be the less surprised, as their type was found even among those whom

* These remarks are from Archbishop Thomson's art. JESUS CHRIST, in the *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. i p. 1055.


¹⁰ Matt. xii. 9-14; Mark iii. 1-6; Luke vi. 6-11.

¹¹ Matt. xii. 15-21; Mark iii. 7-12: comp. Is. xi. 10, xl. 1-8.

he himself chose for his ministers and companions. So now he proceeds to provide for his Church the teachers who were to guide them, and the doctrines which they were to teach and the people to receive; the former by appointing the Twelve Apostles, the latter by the discourse known as the *Sermon on the Mount*. Not that his appointments were, in either case, complete or final. Much was left to be ordered and revealed in the future, by his own teaching, by the free action of spiritual life in his people, and especially by the direction of the Holy Spirit, poured out after he had left the earth. The ministers whom he now appointed were those needed to bear witness to his own deeds and words; the truths he taught were those essential to the very entrance into his kingdom.

One or two preliminary questions need to be cleared up. St. John's silence alike concerning the appointment of the Apostles and the Sermon on the Mount is at once explained by the supplemental character of his Gospel. St. Mark's omission of the Sermon on the Mount in the regular order of the narrative, though he gives many of its precepts as they were repeated by our Saviour on other occasions, may be accounted for by the relation in which his Gospel stands to that of Matthew. It seems quite clear that Mark wrote with some knowledge of the Gospel of Matthew, and with the especial view of giving an account of Christ's ministry briefer on the whole, but more minute in some of the details. He therefore omits many things, which could be passed over without disturbing the order of the narrative, and which Matthew had already sufficiently recorded, and among them the Sermon on the Mount.

The comparison of Matthew and Luke has raised the question whether the two Evangelists record the same or different discourses. The different order in which the discourse stands in the two Gospels is of no importance; for, as already observed, Matthew evidently assigns it as early a place as possible. As to his not mentioning, till much later, the appointment of the Apostles, which Luke places immediately before the Sermon on the Mount, the fact is that Matthew does not directly relate their appointment, but the commission given them when they were first sent forth, and he takes this occasion incidentally to mention their names. The positive arguments for the identity of the two discourses are overwhelming, and the very variations tend to establish an essential sameness. Both begin with the same blessings, and end with the same striking parable concerning the difference between hearing and doing. Between this common begin-



• Hebron with Jerusalem



THE HOLY LAND

to illustrate the

NEW TESTAMENT.

True Geographical Miles - 60-100

East of Greenwich

ning and ending, there is much in Matthew which Luke does not give, and some passages in Luke which do not appear in Matthew; but the former are just those that relate to the laws, traditions, and practices of the Jews, while the latter come in with such natural force and beauty, as further illustrations and steps in the argument, as to put their real connection with it beyond a question: while the passages common to the two Evangelists are perfectly identical in substance, follow in the same order, and contain those truths which are of universal concern to the disciples of Christ in every age. St. Luke's greater brevity may also be explained by his repetition of the like sentiments in other passages of his Gospel.

But these repetitions, as well as those already noticed in Mark, have been urged as arguments for supposing that the so-called "Sermon on the Mount" is but a collection into one view of doctrines and precepts uttered by our Lord on various occasions. Doubtless he did repeat, again and again, these most essential elements of his teaching, and such repetitions serve to indicate the Sermon on the Mount as really the *preliminary abstract of his doctrine*.¹² That the truths thus repeated were really uttered in this connected discourse, is the positive statement of Matthew and Luke, confirmed by the common circumstances that attend it in the two Gospels. Both mark the *same period* of our Lord's ministry, when the fame of his miracles and preaching had spread through all parts of the land, and had brought multitudes around him. Both name the *same locality, a mountain*, which Jesus first uses as a place of retirement and prayer, and of private intercourse with his disciples, and from which he afterward comes down to some elevated station, from which to address both them and the people together.¹³ Both represent our

¹² Stier, *Words of Jesus*, i. 93.

¹³ This view removes the trivial objection that has been raised from the comparison of Matt. v. 1 with Luke vi. 17. The former passage agrees with Luke vi. 12; and, in the latter, the words *ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινού*, which our translators render *in the plain*, suggest rather some *platform*, such as is described in the following quotation from Dean Stanley's work:—
"According to tradition, the 'Mount of Beatitudes' lies a little west of the Sea of Galilee, and is a square-shaped hill, about 60 feet in height, with two

tops, called the *Horns of Hattin*, from the village of Hattin at its base." (See Map, p. 240.) "The situation so strikingly coincides with the intimations of the Gospel narrative, as almost to force the inference that in this instance the eyes of those who selected the spot were for once rightly guided. It is the only height seen in this direction from the shores of the lake of Gennesareth. The plain on which it stands is easily accessible from the lake, and from that plain to the summit is but a few minutes' walk. The platform at the top is

Lord, directly after the discourse, as entering Capernaum; and both record the healing of the centurion's servant as at once following upon his return to that city.

§ 4. Our Saviour's whole position at this period of his ministry not only suggested, but may even be said to have *claimed* some such public exposition of his doctrine as we find in the Sermon on the Mount. His mission had been unfolded step by step, till it lay fully open to the inquiries of his disciples and the objections of his foes; and the time had come to rebuke malignant cavils, to correct erroneous expectations, and to satisfy humble and earnest inquiries. The multitudes who had followed him to the shores of the lake were in a condition not unlike those whom Moses had led out into the wilderness. They had seen and heard enough to prepare them to hear the law of God from his own lips; and they are assembled before a mount, whose very name marks it as far more glorious than Sinai, the *Mount of Beatitudes*. But, in this case, as in that, a solemn pause precedes the utterance of the divine word. The Mediator himself is called to close and secret communion with God, while the people have an interval of awful expectation. Alone, like Moses, Jesus "went up into the mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God."¹⁴

At break of day he called to him his disciples. That this term signifies a select body, chosen by himself from the mass of his followers, is clear from the words of Mark, "He calleth *whom he would*; and they came unto him." Out of this number he chose *twelve*, whom he named APOSTLES,¹⁵ and ordained them, "that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils." For these works they afterward received a special commission from him, and performed them, as his emissaries, during his ministry on earth. After his ascension, it became their chief mission to bear witness to Christ's resurrection, as the crowning fact of his course,

evidently suitable for the collection of a multitude, and corresponds precisely to the 'level place' (τόπου πεδινού) to which he would 'come down' as from one of its higher horns to address the people. Its situation is central both to the peasants of the Galilean hills and the fishermen of the Galilean lake, between which it stands, and would therefore be a natural resort both to Jesus and his

disciples, when they retired for solitude from the shores of the sea, and also to the crowds who assembled 'from Galilee, from Decapolis, from Jerusalem, from Judæa, and from beyond Jordan.'"—(Stanley, *S. & P.*, p. 360).

¹⁴ Luke vi. 12.

¹⁵ *Apostle* is a Greek word—ἀποστολος, "one sent forth," from ἀπόστέλλω, "I send forth."

and by this evidence to call both Jews and Gentiles to believe the Gospel. For this their constant personal intercourse with Christ was the first qualification; and therefore Peter speaks of them as "witnesses chosen before of God, even us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead."¹⁶ So, when the vacant place of Judas had to be filled up, his successor was chosen, according to the rule laid down by Peter, "out of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, to be a witness with us of his resurrection."¹⁷ To this rule the case of St. Paul is only an apparent exception. His want of fellowship with Jesus upon earth was supplied by those special revelations, to which he appeals in proof of his apostolic mission—"Am I not an apostle? Have not *I seen Christ?*"—"Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ *by the will of God*;"—"an apostle, not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead." The marks of the apostolic office, then, were these:—personal intercourse with Christ; appointment by himself; the gift of the Holy Spirit, breathed upon them by Christ and more openly conferred, according to his promise, on the day of Pentecost, giving them power to work miracles and to speak in foreign tongues; to which was added the power to confer that gift on others. The union of these signs distinguished the Apostles from every other class of ministers. The *number* of the Apostles, corresponding to that of the twelve tribes of Israel, is clearly symbolical of their primary mission to the Jews.

Among the disciples chosen to this office, we find, as might have been expected, those who had been the first to follow Christ, and who had already received from him a special call. Though the call of all alike proceeded from their Master's grace, we can not fail to notice those personal qualifications which he himself condescended to own and use in his service:—the firm faith of Peter (the *Rock*); the energy of the sons of Zebedee, whom he surnamed Boanerges (*Sons of Thunder*), united in John with that spirit of love which made him the beloved *disciple*; the fraternal and friendly affection of Andrew and Philip; the devotion and guileless sincerity of Nathanael; the self-sacrifice of Matthew; the practical

¹⁶ Acts x. 41. The superiority of the people" is demonstrated by Bp. such evidence to that which might have been furnished if the risen Saviour had been "shown openly to all" Horsley, in his *Sermons on the Resurrection*.
¹⁷ Acts i. 21, 22.

godliness of James, and the firm resolve of his brother Judas to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints;" and, at the opposite extremity of the moral scale, that love of the world, which made Judas Iscariot an awful example, that even one of those chosen by Christ to live with him and hear his word could yet betray his Master and prove to have been all along "a son of perdition"—for "he knew, from the beginning, who should betray him."

We have seen the conversion and call of seven of the Apostles. The rest (except perhaps Judas Iscariot) were also Galileans, and had probably joined the Master during his circuit of Galilee. The following are their names and order, as given by the three Evangelists (besides the list of the *Eleven* in Acts i. 13):

| MATTHEW. | MARK. | LUKE. |
|--|--|---|
| 1. Simon Peter, and | 1. Simon Peter. | 1. Simon Peter, and |
| 2. Andrew, his brother. | 2. James, and } surnamed | 2. Andrew, his brother. |
| 3. James, and } sons of | 3. John, } Boanerges. | 3. James, and |
| 4. John, } Zebedee. | 4. Andrew. | 4. John. |
| 5. Philip, and | 5. Philip. | 5. Philip, and |
| 6. Bartholomew. | 6. Bartholomew. | 6. Bartholomew. |
| 7. Thomas, and | 7. Matthew. | 7. Matthew, and |
| 8. Matthew, the publican. | 8. Thomas. | 8. Thomas. |
| 9. James, the son of Alphaeus. | 9. James, the son of Alphaeus. | 9. James, the son of Alphaeus. |
| 10. Lebbaeus, surnamed Thaddæus. | 10. Thaddæus. | 10. Simon Zelotes. |
| 11. Simon, the Canaanite. | 11. Simon, the Canaanite. | 11. Judas, the brother of James. 18 |
| 12. Judas Iscariot, "who also betrayed Him." | 12. Judas Iscariot, "who also betrayed Him." | 12. Judas Iscariot, "which was also the traitor." |

In the form of the list, especially in Matthew and Luke, it is remarkable how much the names go in pairs. This circumstance confirms the assumption that Bartholomew is the Nathanael of St. John, who was brought to Jesus by Philip.

§ 5. The close connection between the appointment of the Apostles and the Sermon on the Mount is seen in the statement of St. Luke, that Jesus "came down *with them*" to address "the company of his disciples and the great multitude of people out of all Judæa and Jerusalem, and from the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon."¹⁹ As those twelve chosen ministers stood with him on the Mount of Beatitudes in the morning glow that shone upon the lake, they resembled the heads of the twelve tribes, who were called up with Moses to hear the law given upon Sinai. The discourse which follows was spoken first *to them*, as the manual of their instructions, the code of the new kingdom of which they were the new ministers, the outline of the truths they were to teach. It is addressed also to *the disciples* in general, in that and every age,

¹⁹ Luke vi. 16; where the original is 'Ιούδας 'Ιακώβου. Respecting the whole question of their relationship to each other and to Jesus, see *Notes and Illustrations* (A).
²⁰ Luke vi. 17.

proclaiming the spirit of the new dispensation, to which they profess to have submitted, the truths they have to learn, the obligations they have to fulfill, the tests by which they must be tried, the characters they must bear, if they are indeed the disciples of Jesus.

It was uttered to the disciples *in the hearing of all the people*, to whom, as representing the whole world, it points out the only path of duty and happiness, that which gives entrance to the kingdom of heaven; invites them into that kingdom by the most alluring promises of blessedness; claims their submission to its just and holy laws; and warns them of the danger and ruin of remaining without it. To all these classes it exhibits the characters that all men must bear, the truths that all must learn, the spirit that all must cultivate, the life that all must live, if they would enter into the kingdom of heaven, and ensure the salvation of their souls. It is to the New Covenant what the law given from Sinai was to the Old; and, to exhibit the unity of the Covenants, its precepts are based upon the Ten Commandments, unfolded in all their spiritual breadth, cleared of all the human interpretations by which their spirit had been bound down or frittered away, and expanded into the new law of Love.²⁰ The keynote to this, the main body of the discourse, is struck by the words:—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill;" and, "except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."²¹ The principle of all Christian goodness, and especially of all Christian love, is laid in restoration to the image of God himself:—"Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect;" "Be ye merciful, as your Father also is merciful." And its practical climax is attained in the Christian law of brotherly kindness and charity:—"As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise."

To these precepts there is a *preface* and a *conclusion*. The former insists on the spirit and conditions of entrance into the kingdom of heaven, by repentance, humility, faith in Him and endurance for his sake. But these conditions, unlike the curses of the law, are pronounced as blessings and sustained by promises.²² In the conclusion, the principle of *judgment* is brought in, to enforce all that has been said: character is

²⁰ Matt. v. 21, vii. 12; Luke vi. 27-36.

²¹ Matt. v. 17-20.

²² Matt. v. 1-12; Luke vi. 20-26.

brought to the test of *deeds*, not words; and a final note of warning and promise, equally mingled, assures the hearers that as they sow, so shall they reap; everlasting life from living faith in Christ, destruction from pursuing their self-will.

§ 6. The Sermon on the Mount carried to the minds of the hearers the conviction that Jesus was, to say the least, far above all their ordinary teachers; "for he taught them as one *having authority*, and *not as the scribes*;" and he was followed by a new concourse of disciples, as he returned into Capernaum.²⁵ Here he healed the servant of the Roman centurion, who seems to have been a Jewish proselyte, and whose faith, greater than was found in Israel, called forth the contrast, often afterward repeated, between the multitudes of Gentiles who should sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven, and "the children of the kingdom," who should be "cast out into outer darkness."²⁶ At the gate of Nain, near Capernaum, he repeated by a single word the miracle, which Elisha had only performed with reiterated and agonizing prayers, of restoring the life of an only son to his widowed mother.²⁷

§ 7. About this time we have the last notice of JOHN THE BAPTIST before his death. He was still shut up in his prison, which, Josephus tells us, was at Machærus in Peræa, a fortress celebrated in the history of the Asmonæans and Herodians.²⁸ Here his disciples came to tell him of the deeds of Christ. We can not suppose that John himself had had a moment's doubt of the truth he himself had first proclaimed, that Jesus was the Messiah. On a former occasion,²⁹ he had said enough to clear up all uncertainty and remove all jealousy from the minds of his disciples: but, less instructed and less magnanimous than their master, they still need a further lesson; and for this John sends two of them to Christ. They found him in the act of healing many of their diseases, casting out unclean spirits, and preaching the Gospel to the poor.³⁰ His only reply is to bid them report to John what they had seen and heard, which he would doubtless tell them were the signs of Messiah foretold by the prophets,³¹ and he adds a

²⁵ Matt. vii. 28, viii. 1.

²⁶ Matt. viii. 5-13; Luke vii. 1-10.

²⁷ Luke vii. 11-17. See Keble, *Christian Year*: "Burial of the Dead." The site of the village is the modern *Nein*, situated on the north-western edge of the "Little Hermon," where the ground falls into the plain of Es-

draelon. The entrance to the place must probably always have been up the steep ascent from the plain; and here, on the west side of the village, the rock is full of sepulchral caves.

²⁸ Matt. xi. 2; Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 5, § 2.

²⁹ John iii.

³⁰ Is. xxxv. 5, xli. 6, 7; lxi. 1.

gentle rebuke to their slowness of belief." With this message he sends them back to John, whose life was soon after terminated. Nothing but the death of the Baptist would satisfy the resentment of Herodias. Though foiled once, she continued to watch her opportunity, which at length arrived. A court festival was kept at Machærus in honor of the king's birthday. After supper, the daughter of Herodias came in and danced before the company, and so charmed was the tetrarch by her grace, that he promised with an oath to give her whatever she should ask. Salome, prompted by her abandoned mother, demanded the head of John the Baptist. The promise had been given in the hearing of his distinguished guests, and so Herod, though loth to be made the instrument of so bloody a work, gave instructions to an officer of his guard, who went and executed John in the prison, and his head was brought to feast the eyes of the adulteress whose sins he had denounced.

Meanwhile Jesus, turning to the people, vindicates John from any suspicion of wavering or time-serving that his message might have raised, and bears testimony to his true character as "a prophet, yea, more than a prophet." They had gone forth to the wilderness to see him, and what had they beheld? No pliant reed, that would bend before the wind of adversity: no dainty courtier, to fear a king's frown or a queen's hatred. No! he was the very Elijah predicted by the prophets as the Messiah's herald; but their childish folly, never knowing what to ask for or expect, vented itself in discontent and unbelief alike against the stern asceticism of John and the winning love of Jesus. "But Wisdom is justified of all her children." And now the time was already come for Christ to reveal himself as a *judge*, to those who would not accept him as a Saviour. The cities of Galilee most favored by his ministry—Chorazin, Bethsaida, and especially Capernaum—are doomed to a far heavier judgment than Tyre and Sidon, Sodom and Gomorrha. Such words, uttered now over Galilee, as afterward over Judæa and Jerusalem, show the wounded sympathies of the human friend, as well as the just indignation of the divine Judge; and Jesus finds his only consolation in thankful acknowledgment of the Father's wisdom in hiding the mysteries of the kingdom from those wise in their own conceit, and revealing them to babes. None may attempt to penetrate the mystery of this humble submission of the Son, in his character of Mediator,

* Matt. xi. 1-6; Luke vii. 18-22.

to the Father's will; but it has a practical aspect, which Christ himself proceeds to enforce, as an example to all who labor under the burdens and weariness of the world, to come to him and learn the like spirit of meekness and humility, as the only means of finding rest to their souls. "For *my yoke*"—this of meek submission to God—"is easy, and my burden is light."²⁰

§ 8. Abundant as were the proofs that Jesus was the *Messiah*, the *Christ*, he had not yet been actually *anointed*. This act of consecration was at length performed, not by the high-priest in the temple court, amid the acclamations of "God save the King," as Zadok and Nathan had anointed Solomon, but at a banquet in the house of a Pharisee named Simon, who had scorned to render to Jesus even the common offices of hospitality. There, as Jesus was reclining at the table, a degraded woman stole behind his couch, washing with her tears of penitence the feet for which Simon had offered no water, and having wiped them with the hair of her head, she kissed them in token of homage, and anointed them with some choice unguent from an alabaster box, the purchase doubtless of her evil gains. The Pharisee's indignation at her presence was almost forgotten in his satisfaction at Christ's want of discernment and apparent degradation. "This man," thought he to himself, "if he had been a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him, for she is a sinner." Our Lord replies to the unuttered thought by a parable which leads Simon to confess that they love most who have had most forgiven; and then, turning to the woman, with all the authority of the Anointed of Jehovah, he declares the forgiveness of her many sins for her much love, and dismisses her in peace; while the Pharisees only dare to murmur within their hearts, "Who is this that forgiveth sins also?"²¹

No reader, with a mind unmystified by tradition, could fail to understand the delicacy which keeps the evangelist silent about this woman's name. The assumption—most unfortunately countenanced by the heading of the chapter in our version—that she was Mary Magdelene, is only based on our finding Mary presently afterward mentioned among the women who ministered to Jesus, and as one out of whom he had cast seven devils. This phrase must here, as in every other passage, be taken literally, not figuratively for sins; and thus it implies an intensity of demoniacal possession utterly incom-

²⁰ Matt. xi. 7-30; Luke vii. 24-35.

²¹ Luke vii. 36-50.

patible with a life of profligacy. Argument is, however, almost wasted on an error which has no evidence on its side, except that mere sequence of the narrative, which would just as well prove Joanna, or Susanna, or any one of the "many others," to have been the pardoned sinner. The loss of any countenance to the legends and works of art which have sprung from the mistake is the less to be regretted, as their influence is at least questionable; while the great moral of our Lord's unbounded mercy, even to those sinners for whom the world has none, needs no aid from those who even go so far as to stain the purity of the family of Bethany by identifying *that* Mary at once with Mary Magdalene and the sinner.

That repetition of the act by Mary, the sister of Lazarus, which forms the pretext for this last assumption, had a purpose and spirit altogether different, though there was a certain natural resemblance in the manner of performing it.²² Each showed sacrifice in the precious gift she brought; but with the one it was an offering of penitence, with the other of pure devotion. The "sinner" anointed Christ as the "Prince and Saviour, who gave repentance to Israel and remission of sin:" Mary, whom Jesus had long since loved,²³ gave the funeral unction to the body of her dear friend, in prospect of his death.

§ 9. Jesus now made a *Second Circuit of Galilee*, attended by the Twelve Apostles, and by certain women who, having been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, proved their gratitude by ministering to him of their substance. Such ministry, the chief social comfort of our Lord's lonely life, followed him to his death and burial; and some of these devoted women were

"Last at the cross, and earliest at the tomb."

Such was Mary, surnamed Magdalene, from her native village

²² Matt. xxvi. 7; Mark xiv. 3; John xi. 2, xii. 3, foll. If it were allowable to argue from such minute points at all, it might be urged that the wiping with the hair was in the one case before, in the other after the anointing. That the *feet* were anointed, and not the *head*, in both cases, may have some symbolical meaning, or may have been only a sign of the humility which did not venture to assume a priestly function. But as the times and places were evidently so different, the resemblance between the acts can be no argument for the identity of the actor; and the argument that John xi. 2 *can not* refer by anticipation to John xii. 3 is simply absurd. If we might indulge in conjectural identifications, we should be inclined to suspect, from the real likeness of *spirit*, that the *Simon* of the former scene was the father of Judas Iscariot, the fault-finder in the latter.

²³ John xi. 5.

of Magdala,³⁴ who is now mentioned for the first time, in association with Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others.³⁵ The chief events of this circuit were, the healing of a blind and dumb demoniac, followed by a controversy with the Pharisees, who charged Jesus with casting out devils by the power of Beelzebub;³⁶ the reproof of the Pharisees for seeking a sign, in which Jonah's three days' confinement in the fish is made a type of our Lord's burial;³⁷ the visit of our Lord's mother and brethren, which called forth the declaration, that his true disciples are his nearest relatives;³⁸ the stern denunciation of the Pharisees, and the solemn warnings to all the people concerning faithfulness and watchfulness,³⁹ enforced by the use he makes of the fate of Pilate's victims and those crushed by the tower of Siloam, as well as by the parable of the barren fig-tree;⁴⁰ the great parable of the *Sower*, and the other parables concerning the kingdom of heaven.⁴¹ The same evening on which these parables were spoken, Jesus dismissed the multitudes that followed him, and took ship to cross to the east side of the lake. On the voyage he performed the miracle which he afterward repeated, stilling a raging storm by his word, and thus again showing himself to the affrighted disciples as Lord of the most ungovernable powers of nature. To them the miracle was the more striking from their daily occupation among those waters.⁴²

The country of Gadara (or Gergasa),⁴³ on the east side of the lake, was now the scene of one of Christ's greatest miracles, the healing of the man possessed by a legion of devils, who

³⁴ This was one of the many "Migdols" (watch-towers) of Palestine, and is probably the modern *el-Medjel*, on the W. side of the lake, about 3 miles N. of *Tabariyeh*.

³⁵ Luke viii. 1-3.

³⁶ Matt. xii. 22-37; Mark iii. 19-30; Luke xi. 14, 15, 17, 23.

³⁷ Matt. xii. 38-45; Luke xi. 16, 24-36.

³⁸ Matt. xii. 46-50; Mark iii. 31-35; Luke viii. 19-21.

³⁹ Luke xi. 37-54; xii.

⁴⁰ Luke xiii. 1-9.

⁴¹ Matt. xiii.; Mark iv. 1-34; Luke viii. 4-18. On the subject of our Lord's Parables in general, see *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

⁴² Matt. viii. 18-27; Mark iv. 35-41; Luke viii. 22-25.

⁴³ In the Gospel of Matthew (viii. 28) we have the word *Gergesenes* (Γεργεσηνῶν, instead of Γαδαρηνῶν), which seems to be the same as *Gergashites* in Gen. xv. 21, and Dent. vii. 1, whom Jerome locates on the shore of the sea of Tiberias. Origen also says that a city called *Gergesa* anciently stood on the eastern side of the lake. Even were this true, still the other Gospels would be strictly accurate. Gadara was a large city, and its district would include Gergesa. But it must be remembered that the most ancient MSS. give the word *Gerasenes* (Γερασηνῶν), while others have *Gadarenes* (Γαδαρηνῶν): either one or other of these readings is preferable to *Gergesenes* (Γεργεσηνῶν).

were permitted to punish the illegal cupidity of the country people by entering and destroying their swine." The Gadarenes, caring more for their swine than for their souls, entreated him to leave their country, and he recrossed the lake to Capernaum, where the people were awaiting him." The features of the country strikingly illustrate the circumstances of the narrative. Gadara stood on a partially isolated hill at the north-western extremity of the mountains of Gilead, about sixteen miles from Tiberias, where lie the extensive and remarkable ruins of *Um Keis*. It occupies the crest of a ridge between two wadys; and as this crest declines in elevation toward the east as well as the west, the situation is strong and commanding. Christ came across the lake from Capernaum, and landed at the south-eastern corner, where the steep lofty bank of the eastern plateau breaks down into the plain of the Jordan. The demoniacs met him a short distance from the shore; on the side of the adjoining declivity the "great herd of swine" were feeding; when the demons went among them, the whole herd rushed down that "steep place" into the lake and perished; the keepers ran up to the city and told the news, and the excited population came down in haste, and "besought Jesus that he would depart out of their coasts." Another thing is worthy of notice. The most interesting remains of Gadara are its *tombs*, which dot the cliffs for a considerable distance round the city. They are excavated in the limestone rock, and consist of chambers of various dimensions, some more than 20 feet square, with recesses in the sides for bodies. The present inhabitants of *Um Keis* are all *troglydites*, "dwelling in tombs," like the Demoniacs of old; and occasionally they are almost as dangerous to the unprotected traveler.

About this time we must place Christ's second rejection at Nazareth, if, indeed, it was different from the first." The great extent of this circuit, during which "he went through every city and village," makes it probable that the end of the year 28 should be placed about its termination, if not earlier, leaving the three months before the Passover of B.C. 29 for the third circuit.

§ 10. After this, Jesus made a *Third Circuit of Galilee*, as extensive as the former:—"He went about all the cities and

⁴⁴ St. Matthew mentions two demoniacs, Mark and Luke only one. Le Clerc observes: "Qui plura narrat pauciora complectitur; qui pauciora memorat plura non negat."

⁴⁵ Matthew viii. 28, ix. 1; Mark v. 1-21; Luke viii. 26-40.

⁴⁶ Matthew xiii. 54-58; Mark vi. 1-6.

villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.”⁴⁷ Jesus was followed by multitudes that were at last beyond the reach of his single powers. According to the image used by an old prophet, he saw them scattered abroad like sheep without a shepherd, and worn out with their efforts to come to him, and he had compassion on them. What he had first told his disciples at Sychar had now come true on a far larger scale; the spiritual harvest was too great for the laborers; and so, after bidding them to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers, he gives them their first commission to begin their work.⁴⁸ He sent them out by two and two, giving them power to cast out devils and heal diseases, and to preach the kingdom of God. They were, in fact, to be his representatives, carrying the Gospel to those who could not, or only with great difficulty, attend on his own ministry. He gave them a charge, containing much that would prepare them for their future ministry; but some things suited only to their present mission, especially the prohibition to enter the country of the Gentiles or cities of the Samaritans. This restriction doubtless referred, not only to the gradual process by which the Gospel was diffused, but also to the limited conceptions of the Apostles themselves, who could not yet have preached it except to the Jews.” The charge that he gave them, while containing much that applied specially to their present condition, embraces also the great principles by which his ministers are to be guided in every age. Their success was an earnest to themselves, and an example to all their successors, of his constant presence with his servants. “They went through the towns preaching the Gospel and healing everywhere.” “They cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.”

§ 11. The return of the Apostles coincided with some strange news, which was brought to Jesus from the court of Herod Antipas. We have seen how Herod had imprisoned John the Baptist for protesting against his unlawful marriage with Herodias; and how at last, amid the revelry of a birthday feast, the wanton wiles of Herodias’s daughter had obtained the prophet’s execution. And now that Herod heard of the miracles and success of Christ, his alarmed conscience imagined John risen from the dead, and he desired to see

⁴⁷ Matt. ix. 35.

⁴⁸ Matt. x.; Mark vi. 7-13; Luke

⁴⁹ Matt. ix. 36-38; Mark vi. 6-13. ix. 1-6.

Jesus.⁶⁰ Our Lord would neither incur danger before his time, nor gratify the king's curiosity; and he seems to have had another motive for retirement, in the elation of his disciples at their success. So he withdrew with them by ship into a lonely place. But the people, who saw his departure, hastened on foot from all the cities round the lake; and soon the multitudes not only left him and the disciples no time even to eat, but began to be in want of food themselves.⁶¹

§ 12. At this point the Gospel of John connects itself once more with the other three; and we obtain from it the note of time which has been long wanting. "The Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh."⁶² This must, in all probability, be reckoned as the *Third Passover* during our Lord's ministry; for, even if the "feast of the Jews," in John v., be not the Passover, the intervention of a second Passover is implied in the scene where the disciples plucked and ate the ears of corn. The reason given by John⁶³ for Christ's absence from this Passover is rendered the more cogent from what we have seen of Herod's state of mind; and there seems every reason to believe that our Lord's presence at Jerusalem would have brought on that very conjuncture of Herod, Pilate, and the Jewish rulers, which occurred a year later, when *His time was come*. The season gives a double significance to the miracle by which Christ fed the people in the desert, while their brethren at Jerusalem were eating the unleavened bread of human manufacture,⁶⁴ and also to the subsequent discourse in which Jesus revealed himself as the true bread of life that had come down from heaven.⁶⁵

That discourse forms a marked epoch in his ministry. It is very affecting to observe how, the more Christ multiplied miracles before his Galilean followers, the further were they from receiving his spiritual teaching. The personal benefits they had now so long been in the habit of receiving came to be every thing to them; and the witness which the works bore to Christ was only valued as exciting selfish hopes in them. It was to see and to profit by more miracles, that they ran after him round the lake; and this last wonder of his feeding five thousand men, besides women and children, with five barley-loaves and two small fishes, leaving twelve baskets

⁶⁰ Matt. xiv. 1, 2; Mark vi. 14-16.

⁶¹ Matt. xiv. 13-15; Mark vi. 30-36; Luke ix. 10-12; John vi. 1-5.

⁶² John vi. 4.

⁶³ John vii. 1. "After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would

not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him."

⁶⁴ Matt. xiv. 16-21; Mark vi. 37-44; Luke ix. 13-17; John vi. 8-13.

⁶⁵ John vi. 22-71.

of fragments to be gathered up, while it convinced them that he was the prophet predicted by Moses,⁶⁶ excited proud hopes of independence instead of humble faith in him, and they were ready to take him by force and make him king.⁶⁷ On this first mention of such a design, we may well consider what it involved. It was no offer of a peaceful succession, made by a united people. With Judæa governed by a Roman procurator, and Galilee held by Herod at the pleasure of the emperor—with factions among the Jews themselves ready to support the Idumæan dynasty, and even to cry out, "We have no king but Cæsar,"—His consent would have been the signal for a war such as burst out under Nero. And here we may doubtless see one of those occasions on which Jesus himself was tempted, though without sin. The people of Galilee repeated the offer which Satan had made on the Mount of Temptation; and from Satan it came this time also, though made through them. History furnishes its memorable examples, how hard such an offer is to refuse; and that there was a real conflict in our Saviour's mind is proved by his departing alone into a mountain to pray. But first, while he sent away the people, the disciples, who, we may be quite sure, were ready to take the same part, were directed, not without great reluctance, to recross the lake to Bethsaida.⁶⁸

The night fell, and Jesus watched the lonely vessel, tossed about by the waves and adverse wind, an emblem of the love and vigilance which attends his people in the voyage of life. As the night reached its darkest, and the storm its highest, they thought, doubtless almost with despair, of their rescue from the like peril when Jesus was with them in the ship; but they had to learn that he helps when the time seems all but past, and the means exhausted. It was only in the fourth watch of the night that he came to them, walking on the waves; and even then he made as though he would have passed them; but their cry of fresh terror at the supposed apparition was answered by the cheering announcement of his presence. Then, as so often happens at an un hoped deliverance, presumption succeeded to despair; and Peter, the representative of this feeling among the Apostles, was saved by Jesus from perishing in the waves on which he had had the rashness, but not the faith, to walk. How much they needed such lessons we learn from the statement of Mark, that, even

⁶⁶ Dent. xviii. 15.

⁶⁷ John vi. 14, 15.

⁶⁸ Matt. xiv. 22, 23; Mark vi. 45, 46. "He constrained his disciples to get into the ship."

while confessing Him to be the Son of God, "*their heart was hardened*" to the true meaning of the miracles of the loaves.⁴⁰ We can not, therefore, wonder at the same error among the people, who sought Jesus, as he himself says, not because they had seen the miracles, but because they had eaten of the loaves. Meanwhile, as soon as Jesus was received by the disciples into the ship, its voyage came to an end at "the land of Gennesaret," the fertile plain upon the western shore, which gave to the lake one of its names, and in which Capernaum stood.⁴¹ From all the cities or villages of that fair region, the wonted crowds flocked to Jesus as soon as they heard of his landing, bringing their sick and afflicted; and numbers were healed by merely touching the border of his garment as he passed by. He was found at Capernaum by the people who had been left on the other side of the lake, and who had recrossed it in boats on the following day. Then followed the controversy, in which, notwithstanding what they had just seen, they required some new sign to match that of the manna in the wilderness. In reply, he teaches them the doctrine that spiritual life can only be received by spiritually eating his flesh and drinking his blood. This called forth the full hostility of the carnal mind to spiritual truth, even among his disciples. Many of them said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" not so much hard to understand as to receive with heartfelt sympathy. And now he plainly told them, from his own superhuman knowledge, that there were unbelievers among them; and many of his disciples finally forsook him. Then the twelve, by the mouth of Peter, answer his appeal, "Will ye also go away?" by the solemn profession of their faith in him, as Christ, the Son of God, and the only teacher of eternal life; but Jesus warns even them that "one of them had a devil," alluding thus plainly, for the first time, to the treason of Judas Iscariot.⁴² The defection of the great body of Christ's disciples, leaving only the twelve in constant attendance upon him, marks the last period of his Galilean ministry as a season of special intercourse with them, in preparation for their apostolic work.

§ 13. Among the followers of Jesus during these transactions we have repeated mention of "the Jews," a term which, in the records of his controversial teachings, generally denotes the leaders of the two great parties, and more especial-

⁴⁰ Matt. xiv. 23-33; Mark vi. 47-52; John vi. 15-21.

⁴¹ Matt. xiv. 34-36; Mark vi. 53-56; John vi. 21.

⁴² John vi. 22-71.

ly the Pharisees and Scribes, for the Sadducees seem as yet to have regarded the new teacher with scornful indifference. Many of these came from Jerusalem and Judæa, expressly to watch him;⁶² and their hatred must have been inflamed afresh by such teaching as that just related. The words⁶³ of St. John imply that a new conspiracy against Jesus was formed by the rulers at this Passover, for which reason he remained in Galilee six months longer, till the Feast of Tabernacles. Disappointed by his absence, more of the Scribes and Pharisees went to meet him on his own ground; and their fault-finding gave him the opportunity of denouncing the vain traditions by which they annulled the spirit of the law, while adding to its burdensome obligations.⁶⁴

But they had probably another object besides controversy, to stir up Herod against Jesus, who therefore withdrew for a time out of Herod's jurisdiction, first into the region of Tyre and Sidon, and afterward to the Decapolis. His stay in Phœnicia was marked by that condescension to the prayer of the Syro-Phœnician woman (a native of the country, but of Greck education, the counterpart to the woman of Sarepta in the time of Elijah), which was the first case of his performing a miracle for, and recognizing the faith of, an actual heathen; for the centurion already mentioned was a proselyte.⁶⁵ Passing round the north side of the Lake of Galilee to the Decapolis,⁶⁶ Jesus healed a deaf and dumb man, with many others, and again repeated the miracle of feeding the multitudes that followed him,—4000 men, besides women and children,—with seven loaves and a few small fishes, seven baskets full of fragments being taken up.⁶⁷ Crossing the lake to Magdala (or

⁶² See Matt. xv. 1; Mark vii. 1; and many other passages.

⁶³ John vii. 1.

⁶⁴ Matt. xv. 1-20; Mark vii. 1-23.

⁶⁵ Matt. xv. 21-28; Mark vii. 24-30. St. Matthew speaks of "a woman of Canaan" in place of St. Mark's "Syro-Phœnician," on the same ground that the Septuagint translate Canaan by Phœnicia. The names Canaan and Phœnicia had succeeded one another as geographical names in the same country.

⁶⁶ This name occurs only three times in the Scriptures, Matt. iv. 25, Mark v. 20, and vii. 31. Immediately after the conquest of Syria by the Romans (B.C. 65) ten cities ap-

pear to have been rebuilt, partially colonized, and endowed with peculiar privileges; the country around them was hence called Decapolis. Pliny enumerates them as follows:—Scythopolis, Hippos, Gadara, Pella, Philadelphia, Gerasa, Dion, Canatha, Damascus, and Raphana. All the cities of Decapolis, with the single exception of Scythopolis, lay on the east of the Jordan. It would appear, however, from Matt. iv. 25, and Mark vii. 31, that Decapolis was a general appellation for a large district extending along both sides of the Jordan.

⁶⁷ Matt. xv. 29-38; Mark vii. 37, viii. 9.

rather Magadan), in the district of Dalmanutha,^{66b} he again encountered the Pharisees, this time in league with the Sadducees and Herodians,⁶⁷ who asked and were refused a "sign," some great wonder wrought expressly for them, to prove that he was the Christ. He answers them as he had answered a similar request before; "the sign of the prophet Jonas"⁶⁸ was all that they should have. His resurrection after a death of three days should be the great sign, and yet in another sense no sign should be given them, for they should neither see it nor believe it. The unnatural alliance between Pharisee and Sadducee is worthy of remark. The zealots of tradition and the political partisans of Herod⁶⁹ joined together for once with a common object of hatred. After they had departed, Jesus crossed the lake with his disciples, and, combining perhaps for the use of the disciples the remembrance of the feeding of the four thousand with that of the conversation they had just heard, warned them to "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the leaven of Herod."⁷⁰ So little however were the disciples prepared for this, that they mistook it for a reproof for having brought only one loaf with them! They had forgotten the five thousand and the four thousand, or they would have known that where He was, natural bread could not fail them. It was needful to explain to them that the leaven of the Pharisees was the doctrine of those who had made the Word of God of none effect by traditions which appearing to promote religion really destroyed it, and the leaven of the Sadducees was the doctrine of those who, under the show of superior enlightenment, removed the foundations of the fear of God by denying the future state.⁷¹ He used the

^{66b} The name Magdala is found in the received Greek text and the A.V. of Matt. xv. 39 only; but the chief MSS. and versions exhibit the name as Magadan. In the present text of the parallel narrative of St. Mark (viii. 10) we find the "parts of Dalmanutha," though in the time of Eusebius and Jerome the two were in agreement, both reading Magadan, as Mark still does in Codex D. Dalmanutha was probably at or near *Ain el-Barideh*, about a mile below *el-Mejdel*, on the western edge of the lake of Gennesareth. *El-Mejdel* is doubtless the representative of an ancient Migdol or Magdala, possibly that from which St. Mary came. Her

native place was possibly not far distant from the Magadan of our Lord's history, and we can only suppose that, owing to the familiar recurrence of the word Magdalene, the less known name was absorbed in the better, and Magdala usurped the name, and possibly also the position of Magadan.

⁶⁷ Comp. Matt. xvi. 1, with Mark viii. 14.

⁶⁸ Matt. xv. 39, xvi. 4; Mark viii. 10-12.

⁶⁹ For "leaven of the Sadducees," in Matt. xvi. 6 = "leaven of Herod," Mark viii. 15.

⁷⁰ Mark viii. 15.

⁷¹ Matt. xvi. 4-12; Mark viii. 13-21.

same figure on another occasion, explaining that by "the leaven of the Pharisees" he meant hypocrisy;⁷² that of the Sadducees and Herodians was an ungodly worldly policy.

§ 14. From the eastern side of the Lake of Tiberias, Jesus went with his disciples up the course of the Jordan, staying at Bethsaida,⁷³ where he healed a blind man, to Cæsarea Philippi, near the sources of the river. This city, at the very extremity of the Holy Land, marking the northmost limit of our Saviour's travels,⁷⁴ was the scene of some of the most memorable events in his course; events that were designed to prepare the disciples for the consummation now rapidly approaching. We have seen, and we might, had the plan of this work permitted detailed exposition, have traced much more minutely, the gradual development of the faith of the disciples in their Lord. Now the time was come for a full and intelligent profession of their faith. Having first asked them about the various opinions that the people entertained of him, some saying that he was John the Baptist, others that he was Elijah, and others that he was Jeremiah or one of the old prophets risen again, he makes the direct appeal to them:—"But whom say ye that I am?" Without waiting to consult the rest, Peter answers, "Thou art the CHRIST, the Son of the living God." This formula was not uttered now for the first time; but on no former occasion does it seem to have expressed a conviction so deep and spiritual. It calls forth a blessing upon Simon, as having spoken by the express revelation of God; and then is added that great saying concerning the foundation of Christ's Church, which has been perverted into the cornerstone of the Romish faith.⁷⁵ Its true interpretation is to be found in the Hebrew custom of giving significant names, not solely, or even chiefly, to describe qualities in the persons who bore them, but to commemorate truths in which they were concerned. It is simply absurd to insist on finding in the words, "Thou art *Peter*" the necessary antecedent to "on *this rock* will I build my Church." The true connection is this:—"Thou art rightly called Peter," for thou hast uttered a confession which embodies the foundation of Christian truth,

⁷² Luke xii. 1.

⁷³ Mark viii. 22-26. There were two places of this name. 1. The native place of Andrew, Peter, and Philip was on the W. side of the lake. Dr. Robinson places it at 'Ain et-Tubigah, a short distance N. of Khan Minyeh, which he identifies with Cæsarea.

in the text was N.E. of the lake. It was formerly a village, but rebuilt and adorned by Philip the Tetrarch, and raised to the dignity of a town under the name of Julias, after the daughter of the emperor. (See Map, p. 240). ⁷⁴ Comp. chap. v. p. 105.

⁷⁵ Matt. xvi. 18-20; Mark viii. 27-30; Luke ix. 18-21.

the divine nature and the true Messiahship of Jesus Christ; and *upon this rock* will I build my Church. The concurrent testimony, both of prophecy and of the New Testament, points to Christ himself as the Rock, and the only foundation of his Church;¹⁶ and surely it must be his strength, and not Peter's, which forms a basis too steadfast for the powers of destruction ("the gates of Hades") to prevail against! But still, in a secondary sense, the Apostles are spoken of, together with the Prophets, as the foundation on which the Church is built, but in subordination to "Jesus Christ, the chief corner-stone;"¹⁷ and in this sense Peter himself was one of the first stones of the edifice, of which he himself calls all believers "living stones."¹⁸ His position in the Church is then illustrated by another figure, which has been equally perverted; as if the servant who has charge of the keys of a house were almost on a level with the master himself. The event furnished the simple and natural interpretation, when, on the day of Pentecost, Peter was the first to admit a multitude of the believing Jews, and afterward, in the house of Cornelius, a number of Gentile proselytes, into the Christian Church. He did both as the organ of the other Apostles, who shared his action in the first case, and confirmed it in the second; for to them Christ afterward gave the same privilege that he now gave to Peter. The only distinction between him and the other Apostles is a priority in time, corresponding to the priority of his confession of Christ. As to the power of "binding and loosing," which is more fully expressed after our Saviour's resurrection as the retention and remission of sins, its signification is a question too purely theological to be discussed here.

And now, after commanding his disciples not yet to divulge the great truth they had confessed, he reveals to them the greater mystery of his death and resurrection; but so little, even yet, were they prepared for such an issue of his course, that Peter, the very apostle who had just been foremost in the confession of Christ, now took upon himself to remonstrate and protest, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee!" In these words Jesus sees another assault of Satan, using Peter's prejudices as a temptation to renounce His great work, and He rebukes *him* with the same stern authority as in their former conflict, "Get thee behind me, Satan!" Then, turning to his disciples, he warns them that they must all pass through the same temptation, and make

¹⁶ Acts iv. 11, 12; 1 Cor. iii. 11.¹⁷ Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14.¹⁸ 1 Peter ii. 5.

the same choice between the world and himself, a choice on which depended the salvation or loss of their own souls. They must decide to suffer with him upon earth, if they would reign with him hereafter. For he would surely come in the glory of God and with the holy angels, to reward every man according to his works, and then he would be ashamed of those who were now ashamed of him. Nay! so certain was all this, and to them of such supreme moment, that *some of them* would in that day taste of eternal death; another of the allusions which we have already seen our Saviour make to the character of Judas."

§ 15. Having thus received a foretaste of "the sufferings of Christ," the minds of the disciples were soon relieved by a glimpse of "the glory that should follow." Just a week after the above discourse, Jesus took with him Peter, James, and John, the three disciples who were also to be the witnesses of his agony at Gethsemane, to behold a vision of his heavenly glory. The scene is traditionally identified with Mount Tabor, but this can not have been the place: all we can infer from the Gospel narrative is, that it was a high mountain near to Cæsarea Philippi.⁹⁰ His first object was prayer; and as he prayed, his face and raiment were transfigured to the same glorious majesty and brilliant whiteness in which he appeared to John long afterward at Patmos. With him were seen in glory Moses and Elijah, the lawgiver and reformer of the Old Covenant; and their converse with him concerning "his decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem" showed to the disciples the harmony of the Law and the Prophets with the Gospel in regarding Christ's sufferings as the prelude to his glory; and that that glory would be shared by his followers, was intimated by the glory in which Moses and Elijah themselves appeared. Nor was there wanting a sensible proof of the presence of God the Father; but instead of the "blackness, and darkness, and tempest," amid which God had revealed himself both to Moses and Elijah upon Mount Sinai, it was a *bright cloud* out of which a voice came, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." The disciples, who had given way, while the Master was praying, to a supernatural drowsiness like that which overcame them at Gethsemane, awoke just in time for Peter to express the fond desire to remain amid such bliss, when the voice was heard

⁹⁰ Matt. xvi. 21-28; Mark viii. 31, ix. 1; Luke ix. 22-27. See Bp. Horsley's 4th Sermon.

⁹⁰ Possibly one of the lower summits of Hermon itself. See *Notes and Illustrations* (C).

from the cloud, the vision vanished, and they were left alone with Jesus. As they came down from the mountain, he charged them not to tell what they had seen, till after his resurrection; and he explained, in reply to their inquiries about the coming of Elijah before the Messiah, that Elijah had already come in the person of John the Baptist, and had been persecuted by those very scribes who had taught men to expect him, and so the Son of Man would also suffer.⁸¹

The three disciples descended with Jesus to the world beneath, in a double sense; for a most humiliating scene was enacting in their absence. The remaining Apostles had attempted to heal a frightful case of demoniacal possession; and their failure had subjected them to the scornful objections of the scribes, and the unbelief of the people. After rebuking that unbelief, and bringing the father of the sufferer, who had expressed it, to cry with tears, "Lord, I believe: help thou my unbelief," Jesus cast out the furious demon; and then told his disciples, in private, the secret of their failure, because of their unbelief, and the unbounded power of faith: "This kind goeth not out, but by prayer and fasting."⁸² Once more, soon after this, Jesus foretold to the disciples his betrayal and death, and his resurrection the third day after; but they were unwilling to accept the plain meaning of his words, and afraid to ask him for an explanation.⁸³

§ 16. Jesus now returned with the Twelve, for the last time, to the shores of the Lake of Galilee.⁸⁴ At Capernaum he released Peter by a miracle from his difficulty about the tribute-money, the "didrachm," which corresponds in value to the half-shekel, and seems therefore to have been the poll-tax of that amount, which was paid for the temple-service. The piece of money, a "stater," which Peter found in the fish's mouth, was equal to a shekel, and therefore the precise amount of the tax for his Master and himself. The exemption which Jesus claimed, though he waived it lest he should offend the Jews, may be regarded as an assertion of his divinity.⁸⁵

From the great lessons they had so lately received, the Apostles seem as yet to have derived only a vague idea that their Master's kingdom was at hand, and that they must not lose its advantages to themselves. The contest which arose among them for precedence gave an occasion for our Saviour's teach-

⁸¹ Matt. xvii. 1-13; Mark ix. 2-13; Luke ix. 28-36.

⁸² Matt. xvii. 14-21; Mark ix. 14-29; Luke ix. 37-43.

⁸³ Matt. xvii. 22, 23; Mark ix. 30-32; Luke ix. 43-45.

⁸⁴ Matt. Mark, ll. cc.

⁸⁵ Matt. xvii. 24-27. See the Appendix to the *Old Testament History*, on Weights, Measures, and Money.

ing, by the pattern of a little child whom he set in the midst of them, the great lessons of humility, brotherly love, forgiveness and forbearance ; to which he added that of reverent regard for children, just because they hold out to us an example of the state of innocence from which we have fallen, and which must be regained, by repentance and conversion, before we can enter the kingdom of heaven. And thus the last lesson which our Lord taught in Galilee re-echoes the first with which he opened the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed, the whole discourse, which is reported most fully by St. Matthew, forms a most impressive climax to the teaching which was so begun. Christ's own example, in coming to seek and save the lost, is held forth as the great motive to compassionate love and mutual forgiveness. The power of binding and loosing is now extended to all the Apostles ; his presence is promised in all their assemblies ; and his Father's answer to all their prayers. Once more the solemn warning is repeated, concerning resistance to sin, and decision between the Master and the world ; and the note of future judgment, already struck in the Sermon on the Mount, concludes the whole ; but for the gentle final words recorded by St. Mark :—"Have peace one with another."⁶⁶

Immediately after this the first two Evangelists mention the final departure of Jesus from Galilee into that part of Peræa which belonged to the province of Judæa.⁶⁷ But, in fact, the interval between the departure from Galilee, and the retirement into Peræa,⁶⁸ is to be filled up by Christ's visit to the Feast of Tabernacles, and many other important incidents which are related by Luke and John. The narrative of these events belongs to the next chapter.

⁶⁶ Matt. xviii. ; Mark ix. 33-50 ;
Luke ix. 46-50.

⁶⁷ Matt. xix. 1 ; Mark x. 1.

⁶⁸ John x. 44.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) THE BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

THE difficult question as to who were "the brethren of the Lord" has given rise to much controversy. They are first mentioned in Matt. xiii. 55: "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? *and his brethren*, James and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? and his sisters, are they not all with us?" The natural conclusion would seem to be that Jesus had four brothers of the above names, as well as sisters. But by comparing Matt. xxvii. 56, and Mark xv. 40, with John xix. 25, we find that the Virgin Mary had a sister named like herself, Mary, who was the wife of Clopas, and who had two sons, James the Little, and Joses. By referring to Matt. xiii. 55, and Mark vi. 3, we find that a James and a Joses, with two other brethren called Jude and Simon, and at least three sisters, were living with the Virgin Mary at Nazareth. By referring to Luke vi. 16, and Acts i. 13, we find that there were two brethren named James and Jude among the Apostles. It would certainly be natural to think that we had here but one family of four brothers and three or more sisters, the children of Clopas and Mary, nephews and nieces of the Virgin Mary. There are difficulties, however, in the way of this conclusion. For, 1, the four brethren in Matt. xiii. 55 are described as the *brothers* (ἀδελφοί) of Jesus, not as his *cousins*; 2, they are

found living as at their home with the Virgin Mary, which seems unnatural if she were their aunt, their mother being, as we know, still alive; 3, the James of Luke vi. 15 is described as the son not of Clopas, but of Alphæus; 4, the "brethren of the Lord" (who are plainly James, Joses, Jude, and Simon) appear to be excluded from the Apostolic band by their declared unbelief in his Messiahship (John vii. 8-5), and by being formally distinguished from the disciples by the Gospel-writers (Matt. xii. 48; Mark iii. 33; John ii. 12; Acts i. 14); 5, James and Jude are not designated as the Lord's brethren in the list of the Apostles; 6, Mary is designated as mother of James and Joses, whereas she would have been called mother of James and Jude, had James and Jude been Apostles, and Joses not an Apostle (Matt. xxvii. 46).

These are the six chief objections which may be made to the hypothesis of there being but one family of brethren named James, Joses, Jude and Simon. The following answers may be given:

Objection 1. — "They are called *brethren*." But there can be no doubt that ἀδελφοί frequently signifies not "brothers," but cousins or other near relations; and the translation of the word by "brothers" in Matt. xiii. 55 would produce very grave difficulties. For, first, it introduces two sets of four first cousins, bearing the same names of James, Joses, Jude and Simon, who appear upon the stage without any

thing to show which is the son of Clopas, and which his cousin; and secondly, it drives us to take our choice between three doubtful and improbable hypotheses as to the parentage of this second set of James, Joses, Jude, and Simon. There are three such hypotheses:—(a.) The Eastern hypothesis, that they were the children of Joseph by a former wife. (b.) The Helvidian hypothesis, that James, Joses, Jude, Simon, and the three sisters, were children of Joseph and Mary. This hypothesis also creates two sets of cousins with the same names, and it seems to be scarcely compatible with our Lord's recommending his mother to the care of St. John at his own death; for if, as has been suggested, though with great improbability, her sons might at that time have been unbelievers, Jesus would have known that that unbelief was only to continue for a few days. (c.) The Levirate hypothesis may be passed by. It was a mere attempt made in the eleventh century to reconcile the Greek and Latin traditions by supposing that Joseph and Clopas were brothers, and that Joseph raised up seed to his dead brother.

Objection 2.—"The Four brothers and their sisters are always found living and moving about with the Virgin Mary." If they were the children of Clopas, the Virgin Mary was their aunt. Her own husband would appear without doubt to have died at some time between A.D. 8 and A.D. 26. Nor have we any reason for believing Clopas to have been alive during our Lord's ministry. What difficulty is there in supposing that the two widowed sisters should have lived together, the more so as one of them had but one son, and he was often taken from her by his ministerial duties? And would it not be most natural that two families of first cousins thus living together should be popularly looked

upon as one family, and spoken of as brothers and sisters instead of cousins? It is noticeable that St. Mary is nowhere called the mother of the four brothers.

Objection 3.—"James the Apostle is said to be the son of Alphæus, not of Clopas." But Alphæus and Clopas are the same name rendered into the Greek language in two different but ordinary and recognized ways, from the Aramaic word. (Compare the two forms Clovis and Aloysius.)

Objection 4.—Dean Alford considers John vii. 5, compared with vi. 67-70, to decide that none of the brothers of the Lord were of the number of the Twelve. If this verse, as he states, makes the "crowning difficulty" to the hypothesis of the identity of James the son of Alphæus, the Apostle, with James the brother of the Lord, the difficulties are not too formidable to be overcome. Many of the disciples having left Jesus, St. Peter bursts out in the name of the Twelve with a warm expression of faith and love; and after that—very likely (see Greswell's *Harmony*) full six months afterward—the Evangelist states that "neither did His brethren believe on Him." Does it follow from hence that all his brethren disbelieved? Let us compare other passages in Scripture. St. Matthew and St. Mark state that the thieves railed on our Lord upon the Cross. Are we therefore to disbelieve St. Luke, who says that one of the thieves was penitent, and did not rail? (Luke xxiii. 39, 40.) St. Luke and St. John say that the soldiers offered vinegar. Are we to believe that all did so? or, as St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us, that only one did it? (Luke xxiii. 36; John xix. 29; Mark xv. 36; Matt. xxvii. 48.) St. Matthew tells us that "his disciples" had indignation, when Mary poured the ointment on the Lord's head. Are we to suppose this

true of all? or of Judas Iscariot, and perhaps some others, according to John xii. 4, and Mark xiv. 4? It is not at all necessary to suppose that St. John is here speaking of all the brethren. If Joses, Simon, and the three sisters disbelieved, it would be quite sufficient ground for the statement of the Evangelist. The same may be said of Matt. xii. 47, Mark iii. 32, where it is reported to Him that his mother and his brethren, designated by St. Mark (iii. 21) as *οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ*, were standing without. Nor does it necessarily follow that the disbelief of the brethren was of such a nature that James and Jude, Apostles though they were, and vouched for half a year before by the warm-tempered Peter, could have had no share in it. It might have been similar to that feeling of unfaithful restlessness which perhaps moved St. John Baptist to send his disciples to make their inquiry of the Lord (see Grotius in *loc.*, and Lardner, vi. p. 497. Lond. 1788). With regard to John ii. 12, Acts i. 14, we may say that "his brethren" are no more excluded from the disciples in the first passage, and from the Apostles in the second, by being mentioned parallel with them, than "the other Apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas" (1 Cor. ix. 5), excludes Peter from the Apostolic band.

Objection 5.—"If the title of brethren of the Lord had belonged to James and Jude, they would have been designated by it in the list of the Apostles." The omission of a title is so slight a ground for an argument that we may pass this by.

Objection 6.—That Mary the wife of Clopas should be designated by the title of Mary the mother of James and Joses, to the exclusion of Jude, if James and Jude were Apostles, appears to Dean Alford extremely improbable. There is no improbability

in it, if Joses was, as would seem likely, an elder brother of Jude, and next in order to James.

(B.) THE PARABLES OF CHRIST.

The word *Parable* (*παραβολή*) does not of itself imply a narrative. The juxtaposition of two things, differing in most points, but agreeing in some, is sufficient to bring the comparison thus produced within the etymology of the word. In Hellenistic Greek the word acquired a meaning co-extensive with that of the Hebrew *māshāl*, for which the LXX. writers, with hardly an exception, make it the equivalent. That word (= *similitude*) had a large range of application, and was applied sometimes to the shortest proverbs (1 Sam. x. 12, xxiv. 18; 2 Chr. vii. 20), sometimes to dark prophetic utterances (Num. xxiii. 7, 18, xxiv. 3; Ez. xx. 49), sometimes to enigmatic maxims (Ps. lxxviii. 2; Prov. i. 6), or metaphors expanded into a narrative (Ez. xii. 22). In Ecclesiasticus the word occurs with a striking frequency, and, as will be seen hereafter, its use by the Son of Sirach throws light on the position occupied by parables in our Lord's teaching. In the N. T. itself the word is used with a like latitude. While attached most frequently to the illustrations which have given it a special meaning, it is also applied to a short saying, like "Physician, heal thyself" (Luke iv. 23), to a mere comparison without a narrative (Matt. xxiv. 32), to the figurative character of the Levitical ordinances (Heb. ix. 9), or of single facts in patriarchal history (Heb. xi. 19).

To understand the relation of the parables of the Gospels to our Lord's teaching, we must go back to the use made of them by previous or contemporary teachers. We have sufficient

evidence that they were frequently employed by them. They appear frequently in the Gemara and Midrash, and are ascribed to Hillel, Shammai, and other great Rabbis of the two preceding centuries. Later Jewish writers have seen in this employment of parables a condescension to the ignorance of the great mass of mankind, who can not be taught otherwise. For them, as for women or children, parables are the natural and fit method of instruction. It may be questioned, however, whether this represents the use made of them by the Rabbis of our Lord's time. The language of the Son of Sirach confines them to the scribe who devotes himself to study. They are at once his glory and his reward (Ecclus. xxxix. 2, 3). The parable was made the instrument for teaching the young disciple to discern the treasures of wisdom of which the "accursed" multitude were ignorant. The teaching of our Lord at the commencement of his ministry was, in every way, the opposite of this. The Sermon on the Mount may be taken as the type of the "words of grace" which he spake, "not as the scribes." So for some months he taught in the synagogues and on the sea-shore of Galilee, as he had before taught in Jerusalem, and as yet without a parable. But then there comes a change. The direct teaching was met with scorn, unbelief, hardness, and he seems for a time to abandon it for that which took the form of parables. The question of the disciples (Matt. xiii. 10) implies that they were astonished. Their Master was no longer proclaiming the Gospel of the kingdom as before. He was falling back into one at least of the forms of Rabbinic teaching. He was speaking to the multitude in the parables and dark sayings which the Rabbis reserved for their chosen disciples. Here, for them, were two

grounds of wonder. Here, for us, is the key to the explanation which he gave, that he had chosen this form of teaching because the people were spiritually blind and deaf (Matt. xiii. 13), and in order that they might remain so (Mark iv. 12). Upon this we may observe that all experience shows (1) that parables do attract, and, when once understood, are sure to be remembered; (2) that men may listen to them and see that they have a meaning, and yet never care to ask what that meaning is. Their worth, as instruments of teaching, lies in their being at once a test of character, and in their presenting each form of character with that which, as a penalty or blessing, is adapted to it. They withdraw the light from those who love darkness. They protect the truth which they enshrine from the mockery of the scoffer. They leave something even with the careless which may be interpreted and understood afterward. They reveal, on the other hand, the seekers after truth. These ask the meaning of the parable, will not rest till the teacher has explained it, are led step by step to the laws of interpretation, so that they can "understand all parables," and then pass on into the higher region in which parables are no longer necessary, but all things are spoken plainly. In this way the parable did its work, found out the fit hearers and led them on.

From the time indicated by Matt. xiii., accordingly, parables enter largely into our Lord's recorded teaching. Each parable of those which we read in the Gospels may have been repeated more than once with greater or less variation (as *e. g.* those of the Pounds and the Talents, Matt. xxv. 14; Luke xix. 12: of the Supper, in Matt. xxii. 2, and Luke xiv. 16). Every thing leads us to believe that there were many others of which we have no record (Matt. xiii. 34; Mark

iv. 33). In those which remain it is possible to trace something like an order.*

(A.) There is the group with which the new mode of teaching is ushered in, and which have for their subject the laws of the Divine Kingdom, in its growth, its nature, its consummation. Under this head we have—

1. The Sower (Matt. xiii.; Mark iv.; Luke viii.).
2. The Wheat and the Tares (Matt. xiii.).
3. The Mustard Seed (Matt. xiii.; Mark iv.).
4. The Seed cast into the Ground (Mark iv.).
5. The Leaven (Matt. xiii.).
6. The Hid Treasure (Matt. xiii.).
7. The Pearl of Great Price (Matt. xiii.).
8. The Net cast into the Sea (Matt. xiii.).

(B.) After this there is an interval of some months, of which we know comparatively little. Either there was a return to the more direct teaching, or else these were repeated, or others like them spoken. When the next parables meet us, they are of a different type and occupy a different position. They occur chiefly in the interval between the mission of the Seventy and the last approach to Jerusalem. They are drawn from the life of men rather than from the world of nature. Often they occur, not, as in Matt. xiii., in discourses to the multitude, but in answers to the questions of the disciples or other inquirers. They are such as these—

9. The Two Debtors (Luke vii.).
10. The Merciless Servant (Matt. xviii.).
11. The Good Samaritan (Luke x.).
12. The Friend at Midnight (Luke xi.).
13. The Rich Fool (Luke xii.).
14. The Wedding-Feast (Luke xii.).
15. The Fig-Tree (Luke xiii.).

*The number of parables in the Gospels will of course depend on the range given to the application of the name. Thus Mr. Greswell reckons twenty-seven; Archbishop Trench, thirty. By others, the number has been extended to fifty.

16. The Great Supper (Luke xiv.).
17. The Lost Sheep (Matt. xviii.; Luke xv.).
18. The Lost Piece of Money (Luke xv.).
19. The Prodigal Son (Luke xv.).
20. The Unjust Steward (Luke xvi.).
21. The Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke xvi.).
22. The Unjust Judge (Luke xviii.).
23. The Pharisee and the Publican (Luke xviii.).
24. The Laborers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx.).

(C.) Toward the close of our Lord's ministry, immediately before and after the entry into Jerusalem, the parables assume a new character. They are again theocratic, but the phase of the Divine Kingdom, on which they chiefly dwell, is that of its final consummation. They are prophetic, in part, of the rejection of Israel, in part of the great retribution of the coming of the Lord. They are to the earlier parables what the prophecy of Matt. xxiv. is to the Sermon on the Mount. To this class we may refer—

25. The Pounds (Luke xix.).
26. The Two Sons (Matt. xxi.).
27. The Vineyard let out to Husbandmen (Matt. xxi.; Mark xii.; Luke xx.).
28. The Marriage-Feast (Matt. xxii.).
29. The Wise and Foolish Virgins (Matt. xxv.).
30. The Talents (Matt. xxv.).
31. The Sheep and the Goats (Matt. xxv.).

It is characteristic of the several Gospels that the greater part of the parables of the first and third groups belong to St. Matthew, emphatically the Evangelist of the kingdom. Those of the second are found for the most part in St. Luke. They are such as we might expect to meet with in the Gospel which dwells most on the sympathy of Christ for all men. St. Mark, as giving vivid recollections of the acts rather than the teaching of Christ, is the scantiest of the three synoptic Gospels. It is not less characteristic that there are no parables properly so called in St. John. It is

as if he, sooner than any other, had passed into the higher stage of knowledge, in which parables were no longer necessary, and therefore dwelt less on them. That which his spirit appropriated most readily were the words of eternal life, figurative it might be in form, abounding in bold analogies, but not in any single instance taking the form of a narrative.

Lastly, there is the law of interpretation. It has been urged by some writers, that there is a scope or purpose for each parable, and that our aim must be to discern this, not to find a special significance in each circumstance or incident. The rest, it is said, may be dealt with as the drapery which the parable needs for its grace and completeness, but which is not essential. It may be questioned, however, whether this canon of interpretation is likely to lead us to the full meaning of this portion of our Lord's teaching. True as it doubtless is, that there was in each parable a leading thought, to be learned partly from the parable itself, partly from the occasion of its utterance, and that all else gathers round that thought as a centre, it must be remembered that in the great patterns of interpretation which He himself has given us, there is more than this. Not only the sower and the seed and the several soils have their counterparts in the spiritual life, but the birds of the air, the thorns, the scorching heat, have each of them a significance. The explanation of the wheat and the tares, given with less fullness (an outline as it were, which the advancing scholars would be able to fill up), is equally specific. It may be inferred from these two instances that we are at least justified in looking for a meaning even in the seeming accessories of a parable. The very form of the teaching makes it probable that there may be, in any case,


more than one legitimate explanation. The outward fact in nature, or in social life, may correspond to spiritual facts at once in God's government of the world, and in the history of the individual soul. A parable may be at once ethical, and in the highest sense of the term prophetic. There is thus a wide field open to the discernment of the interpreter. There are also restraints upon the mere fertility of his imagination. (1) The analogies must be real, not arbitrary. (2) The parables are to be considered as parts of a whole, and the interpretation of one is not to override or encroach upon the lessons taught by others. (3) The direct teaching of Christ presents the standard to which all our interpretations are to be referred, and by which they are to be measured. (*Trench on the Parables*, Introductory Remarks.)

(C.) THE SCENE OF THE TRANSFIGURATION.

The Transfiguration is usually placed on Mount Tabor, which is one of the most interesting and remarkable of the single mountains of Palestine. It rises abruptly from the north-eastern arm of the Plain of Esdraelon, and stands entirely insulated, except on the west, where a narrow ridge connects it with the hills of Nazareth. It presents to the eye, as seen from a distance, a beautiful appearance, being so symmetrical in its proportions, and rounded off like a hemisphere or the segment of a circle. If one might choose a place which might be deemed peculiarly fitting for the Transfiguration, there is none certainly which would so entirely satisfy our feelings in this respect as the lofty, majestic, beautiful Tabor. It is impossible, however, to acquiesce in the correctness of this opinion. It is susceptible of proof from the Old Testament, and

from later history, that a fortress or town existed on Tabor from very early times down to B.C. 50 or 53; and, as Josephus says (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 1, § 8) that he strengthened the fortifications of a city there, about A.D. 60, it is morally certain that Tabor must have been inhabited during the intervening period, that is, in the days of Christ. Tabor, therefore, could not have been the Mount of Transfiguration; for when it is said that Jesus took his disciples "up into a high mountain apart and was transfigured before them" (Matt. xvii. 1, 2), we must understand that he brought them to the summit of the mountain, where they were alone by themselves. It is impossible to ascertain with certainty what place is entitled to the glory of this marvelous scene. The

Evangelists record the event in connection with a journey of the Saviour to Cæsarea Philippi, near the sources of the Jordan. It is conjectured that the Transfiguration may have taken place on one of the summits of Mount Hermon in that vicinity. "It is impossible," says Dean Stanley, "to look up from the plain to the towering peaks of Hermon, almost the only mountain which deserves the name in Palestine, and not be struck with the appropriateness to the scene. . . . High up on its southern slopes there must be many a point where the disciples could be taken 'apart by themselves.' Even the transient comparison of the celestial splendor with the snow, where alone it could be seen in Palestine, should not, perhaps, be wholly overlooked."—*S. & P.*, p. 892.



Bethany.

CHAPTER X.

THE LAST SIX MONTHS OF CHRIST'S MINISTRY. FROM THE
FEAST OF TABERNACLES, A.D. 29, TO HIS FOURTH PASSOVER,
A.D. 30.

§ 1. Approach of the *Feast of Tabernacles*—Jesus challenged by his brethren to show himself—His journey through Samaria, and rejection there—Commission of the Seventy Disciples. § 2. Expectation concerning Jesus—He appears in the Temple—Last day of the Feast—Christ the Living Water—The attempt to arrest him fails—Nicodemus in the Council—The Woman taken in Adultery—Controversy with the Pharisees—The witness to Christ—Attempt to stone him. § 3. The Man born blind restored to sight—Christ the Light of the World—Character of the Miracle—The Man before the Council—His excommunication—The Pharisees blind in sin—Jesus Christ the Good Shepherd. § 4. Jesus at the *Feast of the Dedication*—The Jews attempt to stone him, and he retires to Bethabara—The interval here filled up by St. Luke. § 5. The Family at Bethany—The Raising of Lazarus. § 6. A Council held concerning Jesus—The Prophecy of Caiaphas—Christ's death resolved on—He retires to Ephraim. § 7. His return toward Jerusalem—Denunciation of Herod—Lamentation for Jerusalem. § 8. Events and discourses in the progress through Perea. § 9. He recrosses the Jordan to Jericho—Heals the two blind men—Conversion of

Zacchæus—Christ arrives finally at Bethany six days before the Passover, and spends the Sabbath there.

§ 1. OUR Lord's ministry in Galilee had lasted probably for a year and a half, without a visit to Jerusalem, when the approach of the Feast of Tabernacles called for a decision whether he would go up to it.¹ The tone of his recent discourses proved that his work in Galilee was done. The hollow, selfish, and worldly motives of the great bulk of his followers had been exposed, and his few sincere disciples had received some training for their work, and had been taught to expect the issue of his course. It only remained to give the Jews at Jerusalem one more opportunity for repentance and faith, and then the time would come for him to be offered. The general expectation, with which at this juncture his course was watched, shows itself in the challenge of his brethren, who were as yet not full believers in him, to put his claims to a more open proof by showing himself in Judæa. But, with the answer that his time was not yet come, he bade them go up to the feast without him, while he remained in Galilee for some days, and then went up "as it were in secret."²

This secrecy seems to refer to his traveling by way of Samaria, instead of by the more frequented route through Perea, which, though longer, was usually taken by the Jews of Judæa and Galilee, to avoid intercourse with the Samaritans. The choice of this route, and the previous delay, may have been intended to disconcert some plan for seizing him on the journey; as we afterward find that his sudden appearance in the midst of the feast made his arrest impracticable. It also gave one more day of grace to the Samaritans; but for the most part in vain, as we see in the case of the first villages, to which Christ sent forward messengers, but the people would not receive him, as he was on his way to Jerusalem. The sons of Zebedee, who would have called down fire from heaven, as Elijah did, to punish the insult, were checked by the rebuke:—"Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."³ To various persons who met him, offering to become his disciples, but pleading some excuse for delay, he taught the necessity of leaving all, to follow him.⁴ During his progress through Samaria, he sent forth seventy disciples, two and two, to go before him, preaching the Gospel in every

¹ John vii. 2. ² John vii. 2-10. ³ Luke ix. 51-56. ⁴ Luke ix. 57-62.

place that he designed to visit. This differed in several points from the previous commission of the Apostles. The number of the Seventy, and the scene of their mission, Samaria, alike indicated that the time was at hand for preaching the Gospel to the heathen; whereas the number of the Apostles corresponded to the twelve tribes of Israel, to whom their commission also restricted them; nor had the Seventy received the special training of the Twelve. Some have also seen a significance in the sending forth of the Twelve at the season of the Passover, the beginning of the harvest, and of the Seventy at the time of the Feast of Tabernacles, the end of all the labors of the year. In other respects, their instructions were the same; and they may be regarded as, in spirit, those which should ever guide Christ's ministers. Few in comparison to the spiritual harvest, they were bidden to go forth praying the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers; exposed to the malice of men, like lambs among wolves, they were to preserve their meekness, and to rely on His protection who had sent them. They must neither make provision for the journey nor stay to exchange salutations by the way;⁵ but on entering any house, they were to pronounce *Peace* upon it, and peace should abide there if they were worthily received, or return to them if they were rejected. In the same house they were to remain, eating and drinking what was set before them, "for"—said Christ, laying down the principle afterward so fully developed by St. Paul—"the laborer is worth his wages." They were to deal in like manner with the cities they visited; remaining in those that received them, but, where they were rejected, wiping off the very dust from their feet as a witness against the city.⁶ This sentence gives occasion to Jesus to repeat the doom of Woe! upon the favored cities of Galilee, on which he had now finally turned his back—Chorazin, Bethsaida, and especially Capernaum. He concludes with the assurance that the reception, whether of obedience or contempt, given to *them* would be regarded as given to himself.

§ 2. Meanwhile his movements and character were the great subject of discussion at Jerusalem. While all were asking, "Where is he?" some said "He is a good man;" others, "Nay, but he deceiveth the people." But all spoke privately, for fear of the rulers. It was about the middle of the feast

⁵ Comp. 2 Kings iv. 29.

⁶ Comp. Acts xiii. 51.

⁷ Luke x. 1-16. Some place here the Healing of the Ten Lepers, Luke xvii. 11-19.

when he appeared, teaching in the Temple. To the expressions of wonder at the learning shown by a Galilean peasant, he replied by declaring his doctrine to be not his own, but His that sent him, promising too that whoever desired to do God's will should be taught these truths. He denounced the conspiracy against his life on the old charge of having broken the Sabbath by the miracle performed on his previous visit to Jerusalem. His boldness and impunity raised the question, whether the rulers knew that he was indeed the Christ; but still the people were perplexed by his humble and apparently well-known origin, so opposed to the mystery with which they expected the Christ to come. His miracles, however, which it was felt that the Christ himself could not surpass, gained many converts; and the Pharisees and chief priests at length sent officers to apprehend him. As they watched their opportunity, Jesus continued to discourse in language more and more perplexing to his adversaries, till, on the last and greatest day of the feast,⁸ when the ceremony was performed of fetching water from the well of Siloam, and pouring it on the altar, while the priests sang the words "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation," he proclaimed himself the giver of the water of life, meaning thereby the Holy Spirit. Upon this the controversy among the people grew warmer. Some said that he was the expected prophet; some that he was the Christ; while others again objected his Galilean origin, pleading that Christ was to come of the seed of David, and from the town of Bethlehem. His more vehement opponents wished to apprehend him, but neither they nor the officers risked the attempt. Nay, carried away themselves by the power of his teaching, the officers returned to their employers with the words, "Never man spake like this man." As the rulers began to vent curses on all his followers, Nicodemus, the secret disciple, who was one of their number, ventured to remind them that the law forbade the condemning of a man unheard;⁹ but he only brought suspicion and taunts upon himself, for taking the part of a *Galilean*. This eventful day was concluded by the dispersion of the people to their homes, while Jesus retired to the Mount of Olives.¹⁰

On his reappearance in the Temple, the next morning, a subtle snare was laid for him. The Pharisees and Scribes brought to him a woman taken in adultery, and, quoting the

⁸ Concerning the order of the Feast of Tabernacles, see the *Old Testament History*, p. 220. App. to Bk. III. § 6.

⁹ Comp. Deut. xix. 16-19.

¹⁰ John vii. 11, viii. 1.

law of Moses, that such should be stoned,¹¹ asked for his judgment of the case, "But what sayest thou?" Either, they thought, he must decide against the law, and appear at once a blasphemer of Moses and a partisan of gross sin, or incur popular odium by condemning the culprit to death. But Christ well knew how to repel such attacks by an appeal to higher principles, which at once justified his conduct and condemned his assailants. The same law which adjudged the guilty to death required the witnesses to cast the first stones, in token of their abhorrence of the crime. But who dared do this, if conscious that his guilt was the same? And such was the prevalent corruption, that all the accusers were in this case. So, without answering them, he stooped down and wrote in the sand of the Temple court, what we are not told, but we may imagine passages of Scripture which would carry conviction to the most hardened among them; and then rising up, he says, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her," and continued his writing. They slunk away, from the eldest to the youngest; and as no accuser was left, Jesus dismissed the woman with the words, "Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more,"—an absolution from punishment, which she might, by penitence and amendment, convert into the full pardon of her sin.¹² Two plain inferences from this transaction deserve notice. The tacit confession of gross sin by the Scribes and Pharisees does away with the idea that they were honest though mistaken enthusiasts for what they deemed truth and righteousness; and the fact that Christ does not disclaim the authority to judge the case—nay, assumes it in his last words—gives another proof of his divinity.

Then follows another controversy with the Jews, whose reiterated objection, that Jesus bare witness to himself, is met by the reply that the Father bore witness with him. Whatever there may seem to be of narrow technicality in the allusion to the law which required two witnesses,¹³ belongs solely to their objection, which he repels on their own ground. As their opposition became the more obstinate, he the more plainly traced it to their corrupt nature, in bondage to sin; and in reply to their claim of freedom, as the children of Abraham, he denounced them as children of the devil, because they did his works, especially in seeking to kill Christ; while he not only

¹¹ Lev. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 21-24.

¹² John viii. 2-11. The genuineness of the passage is still a matter of discussion. Its omission from the

best MSS. is accounted for by Augustine from the fear that it might be perverted into an excuse for sin.

¹³ Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15.

proclaimed himself before Abraham in dignity and glory, but assumed to himself the great title of the self-existent Jehovah—"Before Abraham was, I AM." At this they took up stones, to stone him as a blasphemer; but he, who patiently suffered when he was condemned even by the show of law, conveyed himself by his miraculous power out of the midst of the excited rabble, and so left the Temple.¹⁴

§ 3. He seems, however, not yet to have left the city itself; for the order of St. John's Gospel hardly permits of our referring to any other time than this the great miracle of healing a man blind from his birth, which furnishes a critical example of a miracle tried by every possible test.¹⁵ The act itself was prefaced by a rebuke of the hasty judgment of the disciples, curious to know whether the man's blindness was to be ascribed to his parents' sin or to his own. Jesus, on the other hand, saw in him only a fit object for the divine work, which he hastened to perform while it was yet time, alluding to the approaching end of his course in the memorable saying:—"I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: *the night cometh, when no man can work.*" Then, giving a high meaning to the miracle by declaring himself the *Light of the World*, he spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle, with which having anointed the man's eyes, he sent him to wash them at the pool, outside the city, which bore the appropriate name of SILOAM, that is, *Sent*.¹⁶ In this proceeding we have, united with the divine power by which the miracle was wrought, the indication of his command over natural means, and an act to be performed by the sufferer himself (as in the case of Naaman) which at once tested his faith,

¹⁴ John viii. 12-59. ¹⁵ John ix.

¹⁶ Siloam is one of the few undisputed localities in the topography of Jerusalem; still retaining its old name (with Arabic modification, *Silwân*), while every other pool has lost its Bible designation. This is the more remarkable, as it is a mere suburban tank of no great size, and for many an age not particularly good or plentiful in its waters, though Josephus tells us that in his day they were both "sweet and abundant." Apart from the identity of name, there is an unbroken chain of exterior testimony, during eighteen centuries, connecting the present *Birket Silwân* with the *Shiloah* of Isaiah

(viii. 6) and the *Siloam* of St. John. From Josephus we learn that it was without the city; that it was at this pool that the "old wall" took a bend and shot out eastward; that there was a valley *under* it, and one *beside* it; a hill right opposite, apparently on the other side of the Kedron, hard by a cliff or rock called Peristercon; that it was at the termination or mouth of the Tyropœon; that close beside it, apparently eastward, was another pool, called Solomon's pool, to which the "old wall" came after leaving Siloam, and past which it went on to *Ophlas*, where, bending northward, it was united to the eastern arcade of the Temple.

and called the attention of those who beheld him going to the pool with besmeared eyes, and returning with all the joy of restored sight. Many of these had long seen the blind man begging at his accustomed seat, and at first they doubted if it were he, or another like him. Soon agreed that it was he, they learned from him the manner of the miracle which, he said, had been wrought upon his sight by "a man called Jesus," of whom he could not tell where he was,—so plain it is that Christ was a stranger to the man. The wandering neighbors brought him before the Pharisees, whose jealous enmity again, as in the miracle at Bethesda, found a pretext in the fact that *it was the Sabbath day*. The man answered their questions with the same simple story that he had told to his neighbors. The growth of conviction among themselves, already hinted at in the doubt—"Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?"¹⁷—was now shown in an open division of opinion: some repeated the old objection, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day;" while others rejoined with the unanswerable plea, "How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?" They could only agree in throwing the *onus* of the decision on the poor man, who declared at once that he believed Jesus to be a prophet. They now tried to throw doubt on the reality of his former state; and thereby only brought out decisive evidence. The caution of his parents, who would not say that their son had been healed by Christ, for fear of excommunication, added weight to their plain testimony that he had been born blind. Their next attempt to extort from the man himself, under the solemn sanction of an oath,¹⁸ a confession that he had been leagued in an imposture with a man whom they knew to be a sinner, was disconcerted by the answer, "Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see." As their importunities turned to revilings, he boldly reprov'd his judges for their unbelief, and, in his simple faith, declared the great principle—"If this man were not of God, he could do nothing." Exasperated at being thus taught by one whom their prejudice regarded as born in sin, they cast him out of the synagogue. But his excommunication only made the man's faith in Christ complete, and called forth from Jesus the sentence upon the Pharisees that *they* were the truly blind, given up to judicial blindness, the more

¹⁷ John vii. 48.

¹⁸ This is the force of the phrase, *Give glory to God* (v. 25); that is, by

telling the truth, as in the appeal of Joshua to Achan, Josh. vii. 19.

intense because it was willful:—"If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth."

Upon this follows the parable in which he represents himself as the Good Shepherd, who knows his own sheep, and preserves to life eternal those given to him by his Father, by laying down his own life for them, while the hireling (the type of the Jewish rulers) only thinks of saving his own life by flight. And in speaking of the great voluntary sacrifice he was about to complete, he at once asserted his own divine power, foretold his resurrection, and rebuked the impotence of their murderous malice:—"Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." At all this, the division about him among the people became still more vehement, some saying that he had a devil and was mad, others that both his words and deeds disproved the charge.¹⁹

§ 4. From these transactions at the Feast of Tabernacles, St. John passes at once over a period of two months, of which more will be said presently, to the *Feast of the Dedication*, in the winter;²⁰ at which, as Jesus was walking in the portico of the Temple, named after Solomon,²¹ he was pressed by the Jews to relieve them from all doubt, and to tell them plainly whether he was the Christ. He replied by reminding them of what he had told them before, and of the works he had done; and, recurring to the parable concerning his sheep, he accounts for their obstinate unbelief because they were none of his, and re-asserts more plainly than ever his equality with the Father. Once more they took up stones, to stone him as a blasphemer; but he vindicated his claims from the Scriptures and from his works; and when they tried to take him, he again escaped, and retired to Bethabara beyond the Jordan, the place where John had baptized. There he remained for some time, and many were led to believe in him by comparing his miracles with John's predictions.²² From this place of retirement Jesus was summoned to Bethany by the tidings of the illness of Lazarus; and, after raising him

¹⁹ John x. 1-21.

²⁰ John x. 22. This was the festival on the 25th of Chisleu (the beginning of December), instituted by Judas Maccabæus on the cleansing of the Temple. See chap. ii. § 4, p. 37.

²¹ Comp. Acts iii. 11, v. 12.

²² John x. 22-42. It would almost seem as if the place had become a sort of head-quarters of John's disciples.

from the dead, our Lord again retired to "a country near the wilderness, to a city called Ephraim," where he remained with his disciples till the approach of his last Passover.²³ Six days before the Passover, he is again at Bethany; and here the narrative of St. John falls in again with the other three Gospels.²⁴

Now these brief notices by St. John cover a period of about six months—two from the Feast of Tabernacles to the Feast of Dedication, and four from the latter to the Passover—concerning which St. Matthew and St. Mark are almost silent; but on turning to St. Luke, we find it necessary to place in this interval that large section which contains some of the most striking parables and most impressive discourses recorded in his Gospel.²⁵ The three Evangelists all notice the departure of Christ from Galilee for Judæa;²⁶ and the two former then pass on, with only one incident between,²⁷ to the events which Luke places just before our Lord's final return to Jerusalem, concluding with the healing of the blind men at Jericho, in which we have a concurrence of place as well as time.²⁸ Unless, therefore, we give up all idea of chronological order in this part of St. Luke's Gospel, the whole section referred to must be placed between the Feast of Tabernacles and the return to Bethany before the Passover; and then there remains the still more difficult question, which portion of it is to be placed before the Feast of Dedication, and which portion after. The question is one of the most difficult in the whole Gospel Harmony: nor is its importance at all equal to the labor spent on its discussion; for the great discourses and parables recorded both by St. Luke and St. John have no relation to the particular time or order of their delivery. The list of them will be seen in the "Table of the Harmony of the Four Gospels" (p. 373, foll.). Their exposition lies beyond the scope of this work. The order of the incidents, which appears on the whole preferable, and which agrees in the main with Dr. Robinson's scheme, will appear in the following narrative.

§ 5. The two months between the Feast of Tabernacles and that of the Dedication seem to have been spent partly in

²³ John xi. 54, 55.

²⁴ John xii. 1: comp. Matt. xxi. 1; Mark xi. 1; Luke xix. 29, all which passages mark Bethany as the place where Christ entered Jerusalem.

²⁵ Luke x. 17-xviii. 14.

²⁶ Matt. xix. 1; Mark x. 1; Luke ix. 51.

²⁷ The tempting question of the Pharisees, which gave occasion for our Lord's teaching about divorce, Matt. xix. 3-12; Mark x. 2-12.

²⁸ Matt. xix. 18, xx. 34; Mark x. 13-52; Luke xviii. 15, xix. 1.

Jerusalem and partly in its neighborhood, especially in that happy home at *Bethany*,²⁹ the house of Lazarus, and his sisters Martha and Mary. Even here there were differences of character; but Christ knew how to use and improve them. The zealous, active Martha, who seems to have been the elder sister, was the first to receive Jesus into the house, where her gentle sister Mary sat at his feet and heard his word. Busied with the cares of hospitality, in which she desired to show such a guest unusual honor, Martha appealed to Jesus to command her sister's help. But he assured her that all her anxiety was superfluous, compared to the *one thing* which alone is needful, and Mary had chosen that good part, which would be hers forever, when all cares about the body should have ceased.³⁰ Though Martha needed the lesson, as she afterward needed a rebuke to that impatience which often goes with zeal,³¹ we must not misunderstand the narrative, as if she were altogether in the wrong. Her zeal was honored in its turn; and she had an equal share with her brother and sister in the Lord's affection.³²

The highest proof of this affection was furnished by that which is at the same time the greatest of our Saviour's miracles. Driven, as we have seen, from Jerusalem by renewed plots against his life at the Feast of the Dedication, he retired beyond the Jordan, to the place where John first baptized, and remained there for some time receiving many new disciples.³³ He seems to have been still at Bethabara, when he received tidings of what he knew to be the mortal illness of his beloved friend Lazarus. It would be folly to attempt

²⁹ It was situated "at" (πρός) the Mount of Olives (Mark xi. 1; Luke xix. 29), about fifteen stadia from Jerusalem (John xi. 18), on or near the usual road from Jericho to the city (Luke xix. 29, comp. 1; Mark xi. 1, comp. x. 46), and close by and west (?) of another village called Bethphage, the two being several times mentioned together. Bethany is now known by a name derived from Lazarus—*el-'Azariyeh* or *Lazarieh*. It lies on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives, fully a mile beyond the summit, and not very far from the point at which the road to Jericho begins its more sudden descent toward the Jordan valley. *EL-'Azariyeh* is a ruinous and wretched village, a wild

mountain hamlet of some twenty families. In the village are shown the traditional sites of the house and tomb of Lazarus. The house of Simon the leper is also exhibited. The name *Beth-any* is usually explained to mean *House of Dates*; but Mr. H. Dixon has given good reasons for believing that the word really signifies *House of the Poor* (*The Holy Land*, p. 214).

³⁰ Luke x. 38-42: comp. John xi. 1, xii. 1-3; Matt. vi. 33; John xvii. 3; Psalm lxiii. 24-26; John iv. 14.

³¹ John xi. 24, foll.

³² John xi. 5, 20.

³³ John x. 39-42. In the interval before this feast Robinson places the return of the seventy disciples and

to relate, in other words, that most pathetic of all the records that human language has ever embodied. Our Lord gave the crowning testimony of his own works to his supreme power over life and death, by restoring life to a body upon which corruption had laid its hold; and he taught the full significance of the miracle by the words:—"I AM THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."⁴

§ 6. The miracle was witnessed by many of the Jews, who had come out of Jerusalem to Bethany (the distance being only two miles) to console the bereaved sisters. Even the deep distress of Jesus at his friend's death had given some of them occasion to express their unbelieving cavils;⁵ and, while some were convinced by the miracle, others went away to give information to the Pharisees.⁶ A council was at once summoned; and the discordant religious views of the different sects were overcome by the common alarm, lest Christ's success should provoke the jealousy of Rome, and bring down destruction on the nation. Caiaphas, the high-priest, the leader of the rulers, took up the argument of political expediency, and proposed that one man should be given up to death as a substitute for the whole people. These words expressed a meaning far deeper than he himself understood; and his suggestion of a sacrifice to save the people from the anger of Cæsar was in fact a prophecy, which the Holy Spirit uttered through him as the head of the nation, of the atonement which the death of Christ should make for the sins of all the world and the common salvation of all God's people.⁷ From that hour the death of Jesus was resolved on; and the only hindrance to its accomplishment was God's purpose that the sacrifice should be offered at the Passover. To this end Jesus withdrew to Ephraim in the wilderness, and remained there with his disciples.⁸ Thence he seems to have withdrawn beyond the Jordan, perhaps to place himself within Herod's jurisdiction; for he was clearly in Peræa

the parable of the Good Samaritan: Luke x. 17-37.

⁴ John xi. 1-44. ⁵ John xi. 37.

⁶ Vers. 45, 46.

⁷ John xi. 47-52.

⁸ John xi. 53, 54. By the "wilderness" (ἐρημος) is probably meant the wild uncultivated hill-country N.E. of Jerusalem, lying between the central towns and the Jordan valley.

In this case the conjecture of Dr. Robinson is very admissible, that Ophrah and Ephraim are identical, and that their modern representative is *et-Taiyibeh*, a village on a conspicuous conical hill, commanding a view "over the whole eastern slope, the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea" (Rob. i. 4). It is situated 4 or 5 miles east of Bethel, and 16 from

when he commenced that final movement toward Jerusalem, which forms the turning-point in the narrative of St. Luke.³⁹

§ 7. As he proceeded leisurely through Peræa toward Jerusalem, teaching in the villages on the way, he was warned of Herod's designs on his life. The information was given by the Pharisees, evidently with the view of hastening our Lord's return within their own reach—"Get thee out, and depart hence: for Herod will kill thee"—and his answer involved a keen rebuke of their treacherous affectation of regard for his safety. He bids them go themselves to tell Herod that His time was indeed at hand, but that his course was not to be shortened by the wiles of "that fox." His death was to be accomplished by the open violence of his own countrymen at Jerusalem, where former prophets had been slain, "for it can not be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem!" And then, apostrophizing the city, to which his face was now turned, he uttered that exquisitely pathetic lamentation, which he afterward repeated in sight of its walls.⁴⁰ His ministry had led him thither at least four times, and this visit was to be his last, the last visit of any prophet; and thenceforth the place which God had chosen for his house would be left desolate, and they should see him no more, till the day when, in a sense yet to be accomplished, they should say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."⁴¹

§ 8. To this progress through Peræa should probably be referred those most impressive parables and lessons which occupy the 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th chapters of St. Luke,⁴² the last few of which, as already observed, bring this Gospel again into connection with those of Matthew and Mark. As bearing upon the course of our Saviour's history, we should especially notice the warning which he gives his disciples, now for the third time, and in greater detail than before, of his passion, death, and resurrection;⁴³ and his answer

Jerusalem; a position agreeing tolerably with the indications of Jerome in the *Onomasticon* (*Ephraim, Ephron*), and is too conspicuous to have escaped mention in the Bible.

³⁹ Luke xiii. 22; Matt. xix. 1, 2.

⁴⁰ Luke xiii. 31-35: comp. Matt. xxiii. 37-39.

⁴¹ Comp. Ps. cxviii. 26. To make this prophecy refer to our Lord's entry into Jerusalem a few days afterward—an event which preceded his

final rejection—betrays the greatest confusion of thought. Our Lord only alludes to the vain "Hosanna" of that day as a contrast to the true welcome that is yet to be given to Him by the Jews in common with the Gentiles (comp. Rev. i. 7).

⁴² For the enumeration, see the TABLE OF THE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS (p. 375).

⁴³ Matt. xx. 17-19; Mark x. 32-34; Luke xviii. 31-34.

to the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee, which taught that all must suffer with him before they reign with him.⁴⁴

§ 9. He now crossed the Jordan, and advanced toward Jerusalem by the high road through Jericho. That city was the scene of the healing of two blind men, who saluted Jesus as the Son of David,⁴⁵ and of the conversion of the publican Zacchæus.⁴⁶ At length, while the Jews, who had already assembled at Jerusalem to purify themselves before the Passover, were wondering whether he would come, and the chief priests and Pharisees had commanded his first appearance to be announced to them, that he might be apprehended, he arrived at Bethany six days before the Passover, that is, on *Friday* the 8th of Nisan, the eve of the Sabbath.⁴⁷ The Sabbath was spent at Bethany; and to the evening succeeding it we should probably refer (though the matter has been much disputed) the supper in the house of Simon the leper, at which Martha served, while Lazarus sat at table, and at which Mary anointed Christ in preparation for his burial.⁴⁸ His presence there was soon known at Jerusalem, and many of the Jews went out with the double motive of seeing Jesus, and Lazarus whom he had raised from the dead. The living proof of the miracle converted into believers many who had gone from curiosity. At this the Pharisees were doubly enraged; and perhaps history records no example of infatuation equal to their resolve to put Lazarus as well as Jesus to death.⁴⁹ This Sabbath was the ninth of Nisan, which in that

⁴⁴ Matt. xx. 20-28; Mark x. 35-45.

⁴⁵ Matt. xx. 29-34; Mark x. 46-52; Luke xviii. 35, xix. 1. It is unnecessary to discuss the apparent discrepancy, the very existence of which is a proof of the independence and honesty of the witnesses. Possible reconciliations have been suggested, enough to show that there is no real contradiction.

⁴⁶ Luke xix. 2-28. Observe the express notice, in the last verse, of his leaving Jericho for Jerusalem.

⁴⁷ John xii. 1.

⁴⁸ John xii. 2-8; Matt. xxvi. 1-16; Mark xiv. 1-11. In John the feast is represented as taking place in the house of Mary and Martha; in Matthew and Mark as in the house of Simon the leper. But a leper, as such, would have been compelled to lead a separate life, and certainly could not

have given a feast and received a multitude of guests. Among the conjectural explanations which have been given of this difference, the hypothesis that this Simon was the father of the two sisters and of Lazarus, that he had been smitten with leprosy, and that actual death, or the civil death that followed on his disease, had left his children free to act for themselves, is at least as probable as any other, and has some support in early ecclesiastical tradition.

Dr. Robinson (*Harmony*) takes the "six days before the Passover" to include both extremes; and so places Christ's arrival at Bethany on the Sabbath itself (the 9th of Nisan) postponing the feast in Simon's house to the Tuesday evening.

⁴⁹ John xii. 9-11. The first impression produced by this passage

year corresponded to March 31st of the Julian Calendar. The intervention of the Sabbath delayed the execution of the design till the following week, when Jesus at length “offered himself” publicly in the spirit of the prophecy: “Lo ! I come, to do thy will, O God.”“

would perhaps be that the raising of Lazarus was a recent event. But our Lord's absence in Ephraim would whet that public curiosity, for the gratification of which the first opportunity was now given (comp. John xii. 17, 18).
“ Ps. xl. 6 ; Heb. x. 5-9.

TABLE OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

(The Jewish days are to be reckoned from the preceding sunset.)

| | | | | | |
|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--|
| S. | Nisan | 9. | March | 31. | SABHATH at Bethany. Evening; Simon's Supper. |
| S. | " | 10. | April | 1 | Palm Sunday. Entry into Jerusalem. |
| M. | " | 11. | " | 2. | Jesus again in the Temple. |
| Tu. | " | 12. | " | 3. | Last visit to the Temple. Prophecy of his second coming. |
| W. | " | 13. | " | 4. | Conspiracy of the rulers. |
| Th. | " | 14. | " | 5. | Evening. The PASSOVER, and Lord's Supper. |
| F. | " | 15. | " | 6. | Good Friday. The CRUCIFIXION, and Entombment. |
| S. | " | 16. | " | 7. | SABBATH. Easter Eve. |
| S. | " | 17. | " | 8. | EASTER DAY. The RESURRECTION. |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| Th. | Sivan | 3. | May | 17. | Holy Thursday. The ASCENSION. |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| S. | Sivan | 13. | May | 27. | PENTECOST. WHITSUNDAY. |



Gethsemane.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PASSION OF OUR LORD. FROM PALM SUNDAY TO EASTER EVE, APRIL 1ST TO APRIL 7TH, A.D. 30.

- § 1. *The First Day of the Paschal Week*: Sunday, April 1st, the 10th of Nisan; the Paschal Lamb selected—Christ fulfills the prophecy of Zechariah by entering Jerusalem—The *Hosannas* of the people—He returns to Bethany. § 2. *Second Day of the Week*: the 11th of Nisan, Monday, April 2d—Cleansing of the Temple—The barren fig-tree. § 3. *Third Day of the Week*: the 12th of Nisan, Tuesday, April 3d; the last great day of our Lord's teaching in the Temple—Lessons to his disciples by the way—Rebuke of the Pharisees, who questioned his authority—Parables concerning their rejection of him. § 4. Devices to entrap him—The Pharisees and Herodians—The dues of Caesar and of God—The Sadducees and the Resurrection—The Pharisees and Scribes—The Great Commandment. § 5. Jesus now questions them: How is Christ at once David's Son and Lord? Denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees as hypocrites—Lamentation over Jerusalem—Praise of the poor widow—Christ's final departure from the Temple. § 6. His prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, and of the end of the world. § 7. Consultation of the Jews in the house of Caiaphas—Treason of Judas Iscariot. § 8. *Fourth Day of the Week*: the 13th of Nisan, Wednesday, April 4th—A break in the Gospel narrative. § 9. *Fifth Day of the Week*: the 14th of Nisan, Thursday, April 5th, till sunset—Thus

first day of Unleavened Bread—Preparation for the Passover. § 10. *Evening.* The PASSOVER killed—Jesus eats the Paschal Supper with his disciples—He washes the disciples' feet—Reveals the treachery of Judas—Declares that his hour is come; and warns Peter of his fall, and the rest of their desertion. § 11. Institution of the LORD'S SUPPER—Christ's last discourse and intercessory prayer. § 12. They go out to the Mount of Olives—Christ's agony in the Garden—An angel strengthens him—Sleep of his disciples. § 13. Arrival of Judas, and arrest of Jesus—Flight of all the disciples but Peter and John—Jesus in the house of Annas—Peter denies his Master—Jesus interrogated by the High-Priest. § 14. *Sixth Day of the Week:* the 15th of Nisan, Friday, April 6th—GOOD FRIDAY—Jesus arraigned before the Sanhedrim as a false prophet and blasphemer—The suborned witnesses break down—He avows himself the Christ the Son of God; and is condemned and buffeted. § 15. The impotence of the Jews to execute the sentence secures the concurrence of the Gentiles in his death, and its execution by the CROSS—They bring him before Pilate on the charge of making himself a king—*His kingdom not of this world*—"What is truth?"—Pilate finds no fault in him—Sends him to Herod, who mocks him—Pilate's offer to release Christ—The people choose Barabbas—The ensuing contest, and Pilate's final sentence—Remorse and suicide of Judas Iscariot. § 16. The CRUCIFIXION—a Roman execution, with some peculiar circumstances—The place: Golgotha or Calvary—The bearing of the Cross—Simon the Cyrenian—The lamenting women—The two thieves—The wine and myrrh refused—The first of the *Seven Sayings*—*Time of the Crucifixion*—The soldiers part Christ's garments—Pilate's superscription on the Cross. § 17. Taunts and temptations of the passers-by—The impenitent and the penitent thief—Christ's second saying—the Virgin Mary and St. John—Christ's third saying—The miraculous darkness—Christ's sense of desertion—His fourth saying—His dying thirst—His last three sayings—"It is finished!"—Portents at his death—The Centurion's confession—Departure of the people. § 18. Preparation for the Sabbath—The legs of the thieves broken—Jesus is found already dead—His side pierced—The "blood and water"—Physical cause of his death. § 19. The entombment of Christ. § 20. *Seventh Day of the Week:* the 16th of Nisan, Saturday, April 7th, from the preceding sunset—The watch and seal set upon the sepulchre.—*Note.* It is an interesting fact that the days of Nisan fall among the days of the week in the same way in A.D. 30, and in A.D. 33, in which the Authorized Version and Mr. Lewin place the Passion.

§ 1. THE great events of the succeeding eight days, including the "Passion Week" and "Easter Day," must be viewed as one connected series; and the Evangelists enable us to trace the incidents of each day. In denoting the days for clearness sake, by their present names, it must be remembered that the corresponding Jewish days began from sunset on the preceding evening. St. Luke gives us this general description of our Lord's proceedings on the first three days of the week:—"In the day-time he was teaching in the temple, and at night he went out and abode in the Mount of Olives."¹

¹ Luke xxi. 37.

(1.) *Palm Sunday, the 10th of Nisan (April 1st).*—This was the day on which the lamb for the Passover was selected, to be kept up till the time of slaying it. In fulfillment of the type, as himself the Lamb of God, chosen before the foundation of the world but now made manifest, and anticipating the plans of his enemies to seize him, Christ prepared to present himself in the Temple at Jerusalem. But he came to the people also in another character, as the promised son of David, their rightful king and judge. In a most wondrous manner did he unite the assertion of his high claims with the meekness of the victim; while he abstained from giving any just offense to the Roman powers. The prophet Zechariah had both foretold the manner and explained the meaning of this the great advent of the Messiah:—"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy KING cometh unto thee: He is *just*, and *having salvation*; *lowly*, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass."² But there was none of the elaborate preparation which marks a royal entrance. Two disciples, sent forward from Bethany to Bethphage, a village higher up on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives,³ found an ass tied up to a door at the meeting of two roads, with her colt, on which no man had yet ridden, and they had only to say to the owner, "The Lord hath need of them," to obtain them. Whether the owner was a disciple, or whether his mind was bowed at the moment to the Lord's will, is not explained. The only trappings of the ass were the coarse garments of the disciples, doubtless travel-stained and worn; and so Jesus mounted the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives with far less of outward pomp than even David when he returned from exile. But he met with a reception

² Zech. ix. 9. In the old times of Israel, judges and their sons, and afterward the king's sons, rode upon asses.

³ There are no vestiges of the site of Bethphage (the *House of Figs*). We follow the tradition, which places the village about half-way between Bethany and the summit of the Mount, as best suiting the narrative. St. Matthew seems clearly to imply that Bethphage was the village to which the disciples were sent. St. Mark and St. Luke mention "Bethphage and Bethany" together, as villages on the Mount of Olives, at which Jesus arrived on his road from Jericho;

and Bethphage, being named first, is commonly supposed to be the more easterly, but the inference is of course uncertain. It is clear from St. John that Bethany was the place of our Lord's abode, doubtless in the house of Lazarus; and the same Evangelist specifies the time, "on the next day" after the supper in Simon's house; that is, if this supper be rightly placed on the evening of Saturday (Matt. xxi. 1, foll.; Mark xi. 1, foll.; Luke xix. 29, foll.; John xii. 12).—Respecting the localities mentioned in connection with the Mount of Olives, see *Notes and Illustrations (A)*.

apparently as joyful and as worthy of a restored monarch. The multitude who had come to the feast, hearing of his approach, and moved by the crowning miracle of the resurrection of Lazarus, went forth to meet him, bearing in their hands the fronds of the palm-tree, the well-known sign of victory, and spreading their garments beneath his feet. As he began to descend the Mount, in full view of the Temple, all the disciples burst forth into a shout of joy, praising God for all the wondrous works that Christ had done, and the people took up the cry, in the prophetic words of David himself, saying, *Hosanna* to the Son of David, that is, "The Lord preserve the Son of David." They blessed him as the King of Israel, head of the kingdom of their father David, coming in the name of Jehovah, and repeated the welcome with which the angels had heralded his birth.⁴ For the moment, the Pharisees thought that all their plots were frustrated, and said to each other, "Perceive ye how we prevail nothing? Behold, the world is gone after him." Some of them took courage to address him in an affected protest against the enthusiasm which endangered all concerned—"Master, rebuke thy disciples!" And he answered, "I tell you that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out!"⁵

In all this scene, there is more of the king than of the victim; and this was in truth the first part of its complex character. We know, what was as yet hidden even from the disciples,⁶ that the eternal purpose of God for man's redemption demanded Christ's death before his triumph; and we dare not pry into the mystery of any possible alternative. But to the Jewish people the alternative was now distinctly offered, for the last time, between the acceptance and the rejection of their spiritual king, and, even amid their shouts of triumph, the evil choice was made by the malice of the priests and the fickleness of the people. Reverting to the type of the Paschal Lamb; as it was selected from the best of the flock, without spot or blemish, so the people's praises marked out Christ, on this 10th of Nisan, as the faultless Lamb of God. And he well knew the issue; and so, pausing in his triumphal progress as he drew near to the city, he once more bewailed its rejection of the day of grace, and predicted its destruction.⁷

⁴ Comp. Ps. cxviii. 25; Luke ii. 14.

⁵ Matt. xxi. 1-16; Mark xi. 1-10; Luke xix. 21-40; John xii. 12-16.

⁶ John xii. 16.

⁷ Luke xix. 39-44. That frequent repetition, which is esteemed the

mark of certainty, is to be observed in this prediction of our Lord: first, on his way to Jerusalem; secondly, on this occasion; thirdly, during his last day in the Temple; and finally, on his last farewell to the city.

Entering into Jerusalem and the Temple, he still met with the same reception, the people crying, "This is Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee!" and coming to him in the Temple to be healed. What most incensed the chief priests and scribes was to hear the *children* crying in the Temple, "Hosanna to the Son of David;" and, as before, they asked him to silence them; but he only reminded them of David's words, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise." In the evening he returned to Bethany.⁸

§ 2. *Monday, the 11th of Nisan (April 2d).*—Having on the preceding days shown himself in the Temple as King in Zion, amid the acclamations of the people, Jesus now proceeded to the practical exertion of his authority by cleansing the Temple, as he had already done at the commencement of his ministry. There is, however, a striking difference between the two scenes, in the greater severity which he now used. Instead of the command to the dove-sellers, "Take these things hence," he overthrew their seats as well as the tables of the money-changers. While there was a hope of reformation, he had been content with the language of remonstrance, "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise;" but now that the offenders had resumed a traffic doubtless as dishonest as it was unlawful, he takes up the stern language of the judge, not without a hint that the privileges they abused should be extended to strangers, who would use them better: "It is written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer; but ye have made it a *den of thieves*." He continued teaching in the Temple, the chief priests not daring to lay hands on him amid the attentive crowds.⁹

On the same day a striking incident had occurred, on his way from Bethany to Jerusalem in the morning. Eager to "be about his Father's work," and not to disappoint the people who "came early in the morning to hear him in the Temple,"¹⁰ he left Bethany before the hour of breakfast, which in the East is late in the morning; and, being hungry, he looked for some figs on one of the trees, which grew among the olives on the Mount, as is indicated by the name of Bethphage (the *House of Figs*). This particular tree seems to have been distinguished by a show of leaves unusual for so early a period of the season, which gave the hope that there might perhaps be fruit among them; but he found none, "for the

⁸ Matt. xxi. 10-17; Mark xi. 11. | 19; Luke xix. 45-48: comp. John ii.

⁹ Matt. xxi. 12, 13; Mark xi. 15-13-17.

¹⁰ Luke xxi. 38. :

time of figs was not yet." So he uttered the doom against it, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward forever." The sentence took effect at once, and on the following morning the fig-tree was found dead.¹¹

This is eminently a case in which the objections of a short-sighted infidelity carry with them their own refutation; for even the lowest view of Christ's character, as confessedly among the best of men, is inconsistent with such an explosion of unreasonable anger as cursing a tree for not bearing fruit before its time; nor could we understand God's hearing such a prayer! But in truth, he saw in that luxuriant but barren fig-tree a fit *type* of the Jewish people, with the fair outward show of religion that they had preserved since the Captivity, but with no fruit fit for their Lord's use. The figure was the more appropriate in that very point which has been ignorantly converted into an objection. "The time of figs was not yet;" but neither properly was it the time of leaves. The fruit of the fig-tree is formed before the leaves open; and when they are fully expanded, ripe fruit ought to be found behind them. So the tree was a fit type of that premature outward show of devotion with which he was even now welcomed by the people, the fruit of whose "Hosannas" would soon be "Crucify him!" and it was on such a deceitful show that his sentence really fell. In any case, let us remember that he was the Lord of the creation; and this, his only miracle of destruction, furnished a most emphatic warning to the people who had often been described as trees of the Lord's planting, but as often warned that they would be rooted up, if they bare no fruit worthy of repentance.

§ 3. *Tuesday, the 11th of Nisan (April 3d)*, is memorable as the last day of our Lord's public teaching; and the story of it comprises an epitome of his controversies with his enemies, his most solemn lessons to his disciples and the people, and his prophecies and warnings concerning the end of the Mosaic dispensation and of the world itself and his own final coming as the Judge of men.

On the walk from Bethany to Jerusalem, the surprise of the disciples at seeing the fig-tree already dead led our Saviour to inculcate *faith* as the means of working such wonders and of obtaining the answer to prayer, and *mutual forgiveness* as a condition of prayer being heard by God.¹² On his entrance into the Temple, the chief priests and scribes,

¹¹ Matt. xxi. 18, 19; Mark xi. 12-14, 20.

¹² Matt. xxi. 20-22; Mark xi. 20-26.

somewhat recovered from their astonishment of the previous day, demanded the authority by which he had acted. Their object was doubtless to elicit such a declaration of his divine power, as had already more than once exposed him to the danger of being stoned as a blasphemer. Jesus met the question by another, which, while it implied the answer, confounded their scheme. He asked them to tell him, first, whether the baptism of John was from heaven or of man. If they confessed the former, they stood convicted as unbelievers; but, if they maintained the latter, they themselves would be exposed to the fury of the common people, who all held John to be a prophet. So they were put to silence; and Jesus pointed the moral of the scene by the parable of the *Two Sons and the Vineyard*.¹³ Still more striking pictures were given of their guilt in his rejection, and of God's purpose to transfer to others the privileges they had forfeited, by the parables of the *Wicked Husbandmen*¹⁴ and of the *Wedding Garment*.¹⁵

§ 4. Some effort must now be made to check the influence of all these discourses on the people; and each party of his enemies tried in turn both to gain a victory over him in argument, and to entrap him out of his own mouth. The first scheme, concerted by the Pharisees with the Herodians, who were friendly to the Roman power, was to convict him of treason to Cæsar. But he pointed to the fact that their money bore the image and superscription of Cæsar as a proof that, by accepting the emperor's protection, they had themselves decided the lawfulness of paying tribute, and he laid down for all such cases the great law, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." So they were put to silence.¹⁶

The Sadducees made the next attempt, proposing a case which seemed to place the Mosaic law of levirate marriages in conflict with the doctrine of the resurrection, and so tempting Jesus either to join them in denying the doctrine, or to discredit the authority of Moses. After sweeping away the fallacy by declaring the spirituality of the future state, Christ goes on to refute the Sadducean objections to the resurrection out of the Pentateuch itself, which some suppose to have been the only part of the Scriptures that they received. The

¹³ Matt. xxi. 23-32; Mark xi. 27-33; Luke xx. 1-8.

¹⁴ Matt. xxi. 33-46; Mark xii. 1-12; Luke xx. 9-19.

¹⁵ Matt. xxii. 1-14.

¹⁶ Matt. xxii. 15-22; Mark xii. 13-17; Luke xx. 20-26.

argument, from the fact of God's declaring himself to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that "they all live unto God,"¹⁷ may seem rather to bear upon the immortality of the soul than the resurrection of the body. But this was the very point of the Sadducean heresy. They acknowledged neither angel nor *disembodied spirit*, and so from their point of view the argument was conclusive.¹⁸

On learning the discomfiture of their rivals, the Pharisees made a last combined effort for victory. Their own teaching was full of subtle comparisons and minute distinctions between the various commandments of God's law. They might well suppose that they were opening an unbounded field for controversy, and obtaining immense chances of advantage, by proposing the question, "Which is *the great* commandment in the law?" or, as it stands in St. Mark, "Which is the *first commandment of all?*" The reply was at once our Lord's final triumph over error, and the very central truth of all his doctrine. Heedless of their refinements, he marks that as the first and great commandment which is the sum and root of all the rest, LOVE TO GOD; created as a principle in the *heart*, imbuing the *soul*—the whole nature of the living man, formed into a sound doctrine by the *mind*, and carried out practically with all his *strength*. It deserves remark, that the *tongue*, which is so often the only instrument of professing love to God, is not here mentioned. To complete the lesson, and to leave no room for perverse distinctions between duties to God and man, our Lord makes the second commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," the necessary result and complement of the first. The lesson was the more impressive and convincing, inasmuch as this double commandment was not, though it might well have been, the Great Teacher's epitome of the law in his own words, but both its branches were to be found, in so many words, in the law of Moses. So in our Saviour's private exposition of the same doctrine to his disciples, he taught them that it was no new commandment, though it had a new life, as coming from himself; and as a principle created in their hearts by the Holy Spirit.

This was the last lesson of positive doctrine that our Saviour

¹⁷ Exod. iii. 6. "In the *bush*" is supposed to denote this section of the Book of Exodus. The phrase "Even Moses shewed" indicates how much wider an argument might have been drawn from the other Scriptures, and demolishes the fancy that the Jews had no knowledge of a future state. (See above, p. 171).

¹⁸ Matt. xxii. 23-33; Mark xii. 18-27; Luke xx. 27-40.

taught in public. He had begun his ministry by declaring that he came to fulfill the law and the prophets: he closed it by announcing that "Love is the fulfilling of the Law." Scarcely less interesting than the truth itself is the effect it had on the hearers. The very Scribe who had proposed the question, seeing the harmony of the answer with Scripture, and catching a glimpse of its spiritual meaning which all his learning had never given him before, was the first to confess its truth in words worthy of being adopted as the Christian creed, and with a heartiness which called forth from Jesus the reply, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven." There the sacred story leaves him: but may we not suppose him to be a type of many, who were prepared in heart, at this last hour of Christ's ministry, for the conversion which passed upon them after his ascension? ¹⁹

§ 5. Meanwhile our Lord's reply had finally silenced all the cavilers: "No man after that durst ask him any question." And now the time was come for him to question them, and to make a last exposure of their destructive system of hypocrisy, as a warning to his disciples and the people. Looking upon the Scribes and Pharisees, who had assembled in the Temple to enjoy their expected triumph, he proposed a question which at once implied his own double claim to the throne of David and of God, and left those who rejected it in either part without excuse:—How could Christ be at the same time David's Son, and his Lord, seated at the right hand of the throne of God? ²⁰ The only possible answer was that full admission of the spiritual nature of the kingdom of Christ, which would have identified him in all points with Jesus, and rather than confess this, their obstinate silence rejected the last opportunity of offered grace. ²¹

Then ensued our Lord's final outpouring of just indignation on the false and profligate teachers who had long led on the people, like the blind leading the blind, to the ruin they were soon to consummate. The woes denounced on the "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," by the voice of God's own Son in his Holy Temple, in the character of a Judge, and as a foretaste of the last judgment, stand in a striking contrast to the blessings uttered on humble disciples from the Mount, just as the crimes that called them down were the very opposite to the virtues there inculcated: saying and not doing,—

¹⁹ Matt. xxii. 34-40; Mark xii. 28-34.

²¹ Matt. xxii. 41-46; Mark xii. 35-37; Luke xx. 41-44.

²⁰ 2 Sam. xxiii. 2; Ps. cx. 1: comp. Acts ii. 34, 35; 1 Cor. xv. 25.

binding grievous burdens for other men's shoulders, while they would not so much as touch them,—loving all marks of outward honor, even in the house where God only should be honored, and displaying all forms of ostentatious devotion, while their lives were full of rapacity and vice; converting proselytes to the law, only to make them twofold more the children of hell than themselves,—frittering away the most solemn obligations, and at the same time extenuating the greatest crimes, by their false casuistry,—cleansing the outside of cup and dish, which reeked within with abomination that they swallowed as their daily food, “straining out the gnat, and swallowing the camel;”—their hypocrisy could find no fitter image than the whited sepulchres, which they were so fond of garnishing without, while the mass of corruption was still festering within. Ay! and the fact that their chiefest care was bestowed on the sepulchres of those prophets whom their fathers slew, suggested the climax of the denunciation. In their affected care to wash their hands of their fathers' deeds, they confessed themselves the children of those who slew the prophets, and were about to surpass their worst crimes by an act which should bring on them the guilt of all the blood shed under the Old Covenant. At last the utterance of wrath dies away in tones of the greatest pity, as he repeats his lamentation over Jerusalem, and her doom of desolation till his coming.”

Our Saviour's praise of the poor widow, who cast two mites—all she had—into the treasury, as having given more than all the sums the rich cast in from their abundance, is the last event of this day in the Temple, according to the first three Evangelists.” St. John, who passes over the other incidents of this and the preceding day, relates the coming of certain Greeks, who were introduced by Philip and Andrew to Jesus, and the declaration of our Lord that the hour was now come for the Son of Man to be glorified, and for the Father's name to be glorified by his death, followed by the approving voice of God from heaven. A brief conversation ensued, after which Jesus departed finally from the Temple, uttering his last words of promise to believers and of warning to those who rejected him; words addressed especially to many of the chief rulers, who believed in secret, but feared to confess him, “for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.”

²² Matt. xxiii. 13-39; Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47.

²³ Mark xii. 41-44; Luke xxi. 1-4.
²⁴ John xii. 20-50.

§ 6. But the greatest words of this eventful day were uttered by our Lord to his disciples after he had left Jerusalem. As unconscious of what was passing in his mind as they seem to have been inattentive to his prophecy of its ruin, they had called his attention, as he departed from the Temple, to the magnificence of its buildings; and he had replied that the time was coming when not one stone would be left upon another. The eastern valley was no sooner crossed, than they began to ask him when these things would happen, and what would be the signs of his coming and of the end of the world. The threefold form of this inquiry is an important guide to the momentous discourse which Jesus uttered as he sat upon the slope of Olivet, in full view of the Temple. Here he is seen as the great Prophet of the new dispensation, briefly recounting the warnings long before uttered by Daniel, and yet to be more fully revealed through St. John.

The first part of the discourse describes the taking of Jerusalem by Titus, the destruction of the Temple, and perhaps the fearful calamities which attended the final dispersion of the Jews by Hadrian. Equally clear is the reference of the last part, though the point of transition is very difficult to fix, to the scenes preceding and attending the end of the world and the final judgment; and to these a practical application is given by the parables of the faithful and unfaithful Servant, and of the wise and foolish Virgins; while the whole concludes with a plain description of the judgment day.*

§ 7. Meanwhile the rulers and chief priests, with the Scribes and elders of the people, met again at the house of Caiaphas, to consult how they could secure the prey which seemed to have escaped them. The scheme of arresting him in the Temple, or of stirring up either the Roman government or the popular fury, had been foiled by the enthusiasm of the people and of his own prudence and triumph in every argument; and now they still feared that any attempt to apprehend him on the feast-day would provoke an insurrection. The only course left was to seize him by treachery in his retirement; and for this an opportunity was unexpectedly offered this very night. Judas Iscariot, whom Jesus had foreknown as the traitor from the first, came to the chief priests, and agreed to place his Master in their hands for the paltry bribe of thirty pieces of silver, the very sum fixed in the law

* Matt. xxiv., xxv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi 5-36

as compensation for the life of a slave.²⁶ Judas stands alone in sacred history as a man devoted by name, by the voice of the Lord himself, to perdition. How then did he obtain this awful pre-eminence? Simply by love of the world. He is the most marked type of those false disciples who joined Christ in the expectation of an earthly kingdom; and when our Lord's repeated announcements of his sufferings and death showed this to be a vain hope, he prepared to sell himself and his Master to the rulers. He seems to have had that practical talent for business which gains confidence, and was made the treasurer of the little band; and this position became a snare to him. In that character he raised his hypocritical objection to the wastefulness of Mary's act of self-devotion, contemplating the securing the common purse for himself in the approaching end:—"This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein."²⁷ The reply of Jesus, implying his knowledge that Judas cared as little for the poor as for him, seems to have set the seal to the traitor's purpose; for Matthew and Mark place his communication to the chief priests immediately after the feast in Bethany. Whether that feast be rightly placed after the Sabbath (on Saturday evening), or on the Tuesday evening, it seems clear from the three Evangelists that the latter was the date of Judas's bargain, two days before the Passover.²⁸

§ 8. *Wednesday, the 13th of Nisan (April 4th).*—Having, on the previous evening, told his disciples the time of his betrayal, though without naming the traitor, our Lord remained at Bethany till the afternoon of Thursday, and a solemn silence rests over this period of his life. A sacred poet has ventured to fill up the interval:—

"On thee and thine, thy warfare and thine end,
Even in His hour of agony He thought,
When, ere the final pang His soul should rend,
The ransom'd spirits one by one were brought
To His mind's eye—two silent nights and days
In calmness for His far-seen hour He stays."²⁹

At all events, the lesson is most impressive that, in the very last week of his ministry, after three days of incessant ac-

²⁶ Ex. xxi. 32 : comp. Zech. xi. 12, 13; Matt. xxvii. 9. We shall have to recur to the fulfillment of this prophecy, viewed as the completion of the first stage in the establishment of Christ's kingdom (see ch. xix. § 20.)

²⁷ John xii. 6.

²⁸ Matthew xxvi. 1, 2, 14-16; Mark xiv. 1, 2, 10, 11; Luke xxii. 1-6.

²⁹ Keble, *Christian Year Monday before Easter.*

tivity, our Lord secured this unbroken interval of holy contemplation, as the fittest preparation for his Passion. The idea, that he may have spent the day in converse with his disciples, seems to be excluded by the silence of St. John, who is so full in his relation of the next day's scenes.

§ 9. *Thursday, the 14th of Nisan (April 5th).* — "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the Passover must be killed."³⁰ The exact time appointed in the law for killing the Paschal Lamb was on the 14th of Nisan "between the evenings," or about sunset. As to the exact time, the Rabbis are divided: some interpreting the phrase of the interval between sunset and the end of twilight; others of the interval between the marked decline of the sun toward the horizon and the actual sunset. For many reasons the latter appears to be the correct view; and it seems most probable that the lamb was killed soon after the evening sacrifice (the 9th hour), which, allowing for the time of roasting it, would bring the Paschal Supper to the usual hour of the evening meal, and so within the 14th day. The *Feast of the Passover* itself, in other words the *Feast* or *Days of unleavened bread*, did not properly begin till after sunset and the Paschal meal, so that the 15th of Nisan was the *first day of the Feast*.

But, as all leaven was scrupulously removed about noon on the 14th, in preparation for the feast, it was not unnatural to call this "*the day*," or as Matthew and Mark have it, "*the first day of unleavened bread*."³¹ So Josephus, in one place, makes the 14th of Nisan the first day of the feast, which he elsewhere fixes to the 15th; and he assigns *eight* days as its duration.³² These considerations afford great help in deciding the important question—Was the supper which our Lord ate with his disciples on the Thursday evening the true Paschal Supper, or did the latter fall on the following evening, the same as that of his crucifixion?³³ The truth of the former view could never have been questioned, had we possessed

³⁰ Luke xxii. 7. The "Passover" means here the Paschal Lamb. The importance of noticing this will appear presently.

³¹ Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12. Our translators have created unnecessary difficulty by inserting, in the former passage, "the [feast of] unleavened bread."

³² The latter day of course involves the moving all the previous events of the week one day back among the days of the month, the days of the week remaining the same; for that the Paschal Lamb was slain on the evening of *the 14th of Nisan*, and that Christ was crucified on *Friday*, are fixed data.

³³ Joseph. *Ant.* ii. 15, § 1; iii. 10, § 5: *B. J.* v 3, § 1.

the first three Gospels only. They expressly call the Supper of the Thursday evening the Passover; and even if St. John does not so call it, no inference can be drawn from his silence, any more than from his not mentioning the institution of the Lord's Supper, considering the supplementary nature of his Gospel."

There are, however, passages in St. John's narrative of our Saviour's Passion, which seem to suggest the inference that the Passover was yet to be eaten on the Friday evening; but all these passages admit of another explanation." The beautiful idea, of making the time when "Christ our Passover was slain for us" coincide with the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, has influenced many a devout mind; but every such temptation to tamper with historic truth, besides being inadmissible by the laws of evidence, generally involves the retribution of losing some more valuable point. The true view seems to be that our Lord observed this, the greatest sacrifice of the Old Covenant, before he offered the one great sacrifice of the New; and by so doing he exactly fulfilled the type. For the Passover was the sign of God's merciful forbearance to his people: their actual deliverance from Egypt, the type of salvation by Christ, took place on the following day. The case has a beautiful analogy to that of the Sabbath. Our Lord rested in the grave on the Jewish Sabbath, before he instituted, by his resurrection, the New Sabbath of holy joy and active benevolence—the Lord's Day. In both cases the "oldness of the letter" was duly fulfilled, before it was succeeded by "the newness of the spirit." Our Lord first united with the Jews, his brethren after the flesh, in observing the form of the old sacrifice; and then, having done with old things, he took the first step in making all things new, by offering himself as the true sacrifice, "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." These preliminary difficulties being removed, so as we trust to throw a clearer light on the spirit of this, the most momentous event in the sacred history, we return to the narrative.

As the day advanced, the disciples, well aware of the danger of a return to the city, asked the Master where they should prepare the Passover. He sent Peter and John into

²⁴ We by no means admit, however, that this supper is not intended in John xiii. 1. See below.

²⁵ For the detailed argument, see

Notes and Illustrations (B), in which is also given an account of the feast, so far as is necessary to explain our Lord's Supper.

the city to a certain man, whom they were to recognize by a sign, and who, at the simple intimation of the Lord's will, showed them a large upper room, furnished and in proper order, where they prepared the feast. Entering the city privately, while the people were similarly engaged in their several households, Jesus sat down with the twelve apostles to eat the Passover before sunset.

§ 10. *The Evening and Night of Thursday, April 5th: the 14th-15th Nisan.*^{25a}—Following the usual order of the feast, after first assuring the disciples of the ardent desire he had felt to eat with them this his last Passover on earth, and promising its fulfillment in God's Kingdom, he took the first of the four cups of wine mixed with water, which were drunk at the feast, and having given thanks, he bade them divide it among themselves, for that he would not drink wine till the Kingdom of God should come.²⁶ For this refusal of the cup, which he repeated later in the feast, there seems to have been both a physical and a ceremonial reason. In the same spirit in which he refused the opiate, which was commonly offered before the crucifixion, he would not incur either the danger or the suspicion of his mind being clouded with wine; and he abstained also as the officiating priest, about to lay down his own life in sacrifice.

Even as the cup was passing round, the disciples again raised the old question, which of them should be the greatest in that kingdom of which he had spoken. He decided the controversy by marking the place of the faithful servant as that of the highest honor, according to his own example; and promised an ample recompense for their share in his humiliation.²⁷ Then, rising from the table, before beginning to eat the supper,²⁸ he at once enforced the lesson, and gave them a proof of his love enduring to the end, by girding himself with a towel and washing their feet, the most humble of all menial services. Viewing it in this light, Peter, with his wonted ardor, refused at first; but, when Jesus told him that

^{25a} It is impossible here to keep exactly to the Jewish reckoning of the days, as there is nothing in the narrative to determine the precise moment of sunset. We know that the Paschal Lamb was slain before the 14th of Nisan closed; but so near sunset, that the "Lord's Supper" was probably instituted after the dividing point was passed—another indication, perhaps, of the transition

from *old* to *new* things. It was not till night-fall that Jesus went forth with his disciples to Gethsemane.

²⁶ Matt. xxvi. 17-20; Mark xiv. 12-17; Luke xxii. 7-14.

²⁷ Luke xxii. 24-30.

²⁸ This we take to be the true meaning of John xiii. 1. The phrase, "supper being ended," in v. 2, is based on the inferior reading *γενομένου* for *γινόμενου*.

this washing was a sign of union to Him, he exclaimed, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." Our Lord's reply taught the distinction between the washing which renews the nature and that which needs daily repetition to cleanse from daily pollution, and he added, "Ye are clean, but not all;" for Judas had been a partaker of the rite.³⁸

Resuming his garments, Jesus discoursed further of the example he had now given, and once more hinted at the traitor. For now this bitter sorrow had taken full possession of his mind; and their sitting down again to the feast was followed by the affecting scene of his plainly declaring that the traitor was one of them. In their sorrow and confusion they ask, "Lord, is it I? Is it I?" Judas asks the same question, lest he should seem guilty, but he alone hears the answer, "Thou hast said it." Peter now urges John, who reclined next Jesus at supper, with his head upon His bosom, to beg the Master to tell them who should be the traitor; and to his request Jesus replies, "He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it."³⁹ It seems that John had not time to communicate the answer to the other disciples; for when the sign was followed by the command, given with all the dignity of self-sacrifice, "What thou doest, do quickly," they supposed it only to be some commission given to Judas as the purse-bearer, and they were still, to say the least, in doubt about the traitor. So he went forth to concert his measures with the rulers, under cover of the night, which had now set in.

Then Christ announced to those who were left, that the hour was come for the Son of Man to be glorified, and for God to be glorified in him; that he was going before them on a path by which they should soon follow him, but that they were not yet ready; and meanwhile he gave them the new commandment, that they should love one another. The impatient zeal of Peter rebelled at the thought of not following his Master now; and his self-deceiving readiness to lay down his life for Christ's sake was rebuked by the prediction, that he would deny Him thrice on that very night before the crowing of the cock; while the other disciples, who might be beginning to think themselves above the weakness of Peter as well as the treachery of Judas, were warned that they too would abandon Him that night and be scattered abroad;

³⁸ See especially v. 2.

³⁹ Matt. xxvi. 25; John xiii. 26. | portion of the bitter herbs, dipped into
The sop or morsel (*ψωμίδιον*) was a | the sauce, called *charoseth*, as to which
see p. 341.

but he appointed to meet them in Galilee after his resurrection.⁴¹

§ 11. Either just before or just after this scene, as the supper was drawing to an end, Christ took a loaf of the unleavened bread, and having given thanks, he broke it and gave it then to eat, as the emblem of his body, broken for men. Then, the supper being ended, he took a cup, the *third* of those usually partaken of, and divided it in like manner among them, as the pledge of the New Covenant in his blood, shed for the remission of sins. Thus he instituted the LORD'S SUPPER, to be observed to all future time, in remembrance of him.⁴²

Between the end of the meal and the hymns of praise which followed it, there was an interval of most solemn and delightful converse, in which the disciples, bowed down with sorrow at what they had heard, were assured that he would not leave them comfortless, though hated and persecuted by the world, but he would come again to take them to the mansions he now went to prepare for them; and that meanwhile they would be divinely comforted, enlightened, and inspired for their work by the *Paraclete*, the Holy Spirit of truth. Those exquisite chapters of St. John which contain this discourse conclude with that most solemn and affecting of all the utterances of human language, our Lord's intercessory prayer in presence of his disciples.⁴³ The momentous scenes transacted in that upper chamber ended with the singing of a hymn, probably the "Great Hallel" (Psalm cxv.-cxviii.) which concluded the ceremony, and then they went out together to the first scene of suffering on the Mount of Olives.⁴⁴

§ 12. Going down into the ravine which divides Jerusalem from the Mount, they crossed the brook Kedron, and entered the Garden of Gethsemane (the *Oil Press*). A part of the garden still exists between the brook and the foot of the Mount, marked by a few olive-trees, which are old enough to have grown there since our Saviour's time.⁴⁵ Here Jesus took apart the same three disciples, Peter, James, and John,

⁴¹ John xiii. 36-38; Matt. xxvi. 31-35; Mark xiv. 27-31. It is impossible, within our limits, to discuss all the minute questions relating to the order of the different Evangelists. They are ably treated in Dr. Robinson's Harmony.

⁴² Matt. xxvi. 26-29; Mark xiv. 22-25; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23-25.

⁴³ John xiv.-xvii. The break at xiv. 31 is only apparent. It indicates the first movement toward departure; but the discourse is resumed and concluded before they leave the house.

⁴⁴ Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26; Luke xxii. 39.

⁴⁵ The present garden is 50 paces square. That it was much larger is clear from Luke xxii. 41. There

who had seen his glory on the Mount of Transfiguration, to be near him during that last agony of temptation, which darkened his soul and convulsed his frame. Leaving them with the charge to watch, for he knew that the traitor was approaching, he retired about a stone's-throw farther, to pray, while his spirit was overwhelmed with terror as he contemplated the sins of mankind that were now laid upon him.⁴⁶ His human nature shrank from the burden, which his will to save mankind still resolved to bear. In agonizing prayer to his Father, he contemplates for a moment some possible alternative:—"Abba! Father! all things are possible unto thee!"—in the resources of divine omnipotence there might be some other method of saving man—"If it be possible, if thou be willing, take away this cup from me"—in which the torture of the scourge and the cross was the least bitter ingredient; but he leaves all to his Father's will; "nevertheless, not my will, but thine be done!" In no scene of our Lord's life do we behold more clearly the union of his perfect humanity with his divinity. If, at the first view, the former element seems the more conspicuous, we must remember that this was the very crisis of his humiliation, in which, laying aside his divine attributes, "he humbled himself and became obedient to death," bowing down before the Father, as the representative of sinful man. But the very power to do this, the close communion with his Father concerning his will and counsels, and the perfect triumph of resignation over all human weakness, are proofs of his true deity. Encouraged by his example, and strengthened by his Holy Spirit, many a follower of Christ has drunk the cup of suffering and self-denial because it was God's will; but for them that cup has never been mixed with the bitterness of God's wrath. In this fearful conflict Jesus was not left alone. As in his first great temptation, an angel from heaven strengthened him. But his last earthly comfort failed; for, when he came to his disciples, he found them sleeping! The well-deserved rebuke, directed especially to Peter, who had boasted of his power to follow his Master even to death—"What, could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation!"—is softened by the compassionate excuse, "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak!" A second and third time he departs to reiterate the same prayer, and returns to find them

are 8 trees, the age of which has been reckoned at 2000 years. See further, p. 338.

⁴⁶ "He began to be sore amazed and to be very heavy," Mark xiv. 38.

sunk in sleep so profound that they knew not what to answer him. But the third time he rouses them by announcing the danger against which they should have watched, and says, with an irony which lets them know that the opportunity was now past for rendering the last service he had asked of them:—"Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners!" And now that they are fully awake, he adds, "Rise up, let us go; lo, he that betrayeth me is at hand."⁴⁷

§ 13. At the same moment, torches were seen among the trees, and a multitude appeared, consisting of officers of the Temple, and others, hastily armed with swords and staves, sent by the chief priests under the guidance of the traitor Judas; for he well knew the garden, where he had spent many an hour with Jesus. The Lord gave himself into their hands in such a manner as to prove how entirely the surrender was his own act. Twice they recoiled from his presence and fell to the ground, before Judas took courage to give the signal to seize him, by the traitor's kiss. At the sight of the officers binding his master, Peter drew his sword, one of the only two that the disciples had, and struck off the right ear of one of the high-priest's servants.⁴⁸ Christ rebuked his untimely zeal, in obtruding such puny help upon Him who could have commanded the heavenly hosts, and provoking violence from the captors; at the same time healing the servant's ear. Then, turning to the officers, he remonstrated against their show of force as if he were a thief, when they might have taken him any day as he was teaching in the Temple. To both parties he explained that this hour of triumph was granted to them and to the powers of darkness, in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled.

The disciples were afraid to share or even watch his fate, as he had foretold. "They all forsook him, and fled." The concern of Peter to make good his boast, and the love of John, induced them alone of all the rest to follow at a safe distance. There was indeed one young man, an attendant, it seems, on Jesus or one of the Apostles, who ventured to follow Christ;⁴⁹ but, when he was seized by his only garment,

⁴⁷ Matt. xxvi. 36-46; Mark xiv. 32-42; Luke xxii. 39-46. Some interpret the words interrogatively: "Are you still asleep and taking your rest? You have indulged in it long enough," etc.

⁴⁸ St. John alone names Peter and the servant; an indication of the late date of his Gospel, when the names could be given with safety.

⁴⁹ Mark xiv. 51, 52.

he fled, leaving it in the captor's hand. The particular mention of this incident by Mark only, has given rise to the conjecture that it refers to himself.

The divine prisoner was led first to the house of Annas, the father-in-law of the high-priest, Caiaphas; perhaps to avoid committing the rulers publicly, till it was decided whether they would risk a public trial. But there seems now to have been no wish to draw back; and Annas sent him bound to Caiaphas, who had already openly advised his death.⁵⁰

Peter and John still followed at a distance; but John, having some acquaintance with the high-priest, not only ventured himself into the palace, but spoke to the female servant at the door, who let in Peter. To understand what ensued, the structure of an oriental house should be remembered. The gate gives entrance to an open court-yard, and it was in the middle of this court that the servants and officers made a fire to keep off the chiliness of a spring night. Jesus was led into one of the chambers opening into the court, whence he could see what passed round the fire. Where John was we are not told; but it seems that, being known to the servants, he was left unmolested, and so became an eye-witness of what followed to the very end; and hence the vast importance which is assigned to his testimony.

Peter, with characteristic rashness, ventured into the circle round the fire, which was soon joined by the damsel who had given him admittance. She looked at Peter, and recognized him as the disciple of Jesus; but he rudely denied it. Alarmed and conscience-stricken, he retired to the porch, just in time to hear the first warning note of cock-crow. Soon after, another maid pointed him out to the by-standers, saying, "He was also with Jesus of Nazareth;" and Peter's fears only led him to a more resolute denial. About an hour later, the evidence against him was completed by a kinsman of Malchus, the servant whose ear he had cut off. This man declared that he had seen him in the garden. Peter's continued denials only furnished fresh proofs to the by-standers by means of his Galilean dialect; and, thus convicted, he added oaths and curses to the protestation, "I know not the man." At that moment the cock crew again; Jesus turned and looked on Peter from the room where he was waiting in bonds; and Peter went out and wept bitterly.⁵¹

⁵⁰ This point is expressly referred to by St. John, xviii. 14.

⁵¹ Matt. xxvi. 47-58, 69, 75; Mark xiv. 43-54, 66-72; Luke xxii. 47-62; John xviii. 1-18, 25-27. We do not enter on the minor questions as to

Such was the end of Peter's readiness to lay down his life for his Master's sake. More than thirty years later, he was permitted to follow, as Christ had promised him, in the path of martyrdom; but now Jesus had to tread that path alone, as his sacrifice alone could atone for sin. His demeanor throughout his trials, first before the Sanhedrim, and then before Pilate, is to be viewed in a threefold aspect—as a man falsely accused, as a religious teacher called to defend the truth of his doctrine, and as the Son of God, arraigned in his humiliation before those who would in the last day stand at his judgment seat. He knew how the trial would end, nay, how it must end, in order that the very purpose of his mission might not fail; but, while he scorns, in dignified silence, to urge the illegality of the procedure and the weakness of the evidence, before judges who had prejudged the case, neither does he utter a word of unseemly bravado or provocation. "In his humiliation, his judgment was taken away, yet he opened not his mouth!"

The first interrogation seems to have been made by the high-priest just after Peter's first denial, preparatory to the meeting of the Sanhedrim at dawn. "The high-priest asked Jesus of his disciples, and of his doctrine."⁶³ The former question may have been designed to ascertain, before summoning the Sanhedrim, how far the new leaven had spread among its members;⁶⁴ but Jesus betrayed no man. To the other question he only replied by appealing to the evidence of those who had been his hearers, and upon this an officer struck him for contempt of the high-priest.⁶⁵ Caiaphas seems then to have retired to summon the Sanhedrim; and Peter's second and third denials occurred in the mean time.

§ 14. GOOD FRIDAY, still *the 15th of Nisan*, (*April 6th*).—At dawn of day the council met, and Jesus was arraigned before them.⁶⁶ Their first object was to condemn him as a false prophet and blasphemer, crimes punishable by the Mosaic law with death. We shall presently see how they proposed to

the order of the three denials, which again illustrate that unity amid diversity which characterizes faithful witnesses. The double crowing of the cock, mentioned only by St. Mark, is consistent with every-day experience, and forms a valuable note of time; for the cock always crows soon after midnight, as well as at the break of day.

⁶² John xviii. 19.

⁶³ See, besides the case of Nicodemus, John xii. 42.

⁶⁴ John xviii. 19-24. Luke xxii. 63-65, though parallel in time, seems rather to correspond to Matt. xxvi. 17-68 and Mark xiv. 64, 65. But the insolent menials of the high-priest are not unlikely to have indulged in their brutal outrages in the interval of waiting for the Sanhedrim.

⁶⁵ Luke xxii. 66.

execute the sentence. The law required the testimony of two witnesses; and several witnesses were suborned, while others seem to have come forward willingly to court the powers that were in the ascendant; but their testimony was too evidently false to be admitted. When at last two were found to swear to the same point, and to pervert the words he had used about the destruction and resurrection of the temple of his body, into a threat that he would destroy the Temple, they were still at variance with one another.⁵⁶

To all this evidence Jesus made no reply, as indeed none was necessary; till the high-priest reproached him for his silence, and adjured him by the living God to say whether he was the Christ, the Son of God. He might have been the Messiah, and yet not have claimed the divinity implied in the latter title. But he plainly said I AM, and warned them of the time when they should see him sitting in his power at the right hand of God, and coming in the clouds of heaven. This was enough. Rending his clothes—the wonted sign of distress and horror—the high-priest appealed to the council, who at once condemned Jesus for blasphemy, while the officers covered his face, spat on him, and buffeted him with blows, mocking his prophetic powers by asking him to tell who struck him, and adding many other blasphemies.⁵⁷

§ 15. The next step, according to the law of Moses, would have been to have led him without the city and stoned him to death. But the subjection of Jews to Rome had deprived even their highest court of the power of life and death; and, instead of venturing to offend the procurator, they needed all his support, in case of a rising of the people. So they took a course which secured the fulfillment of Christ's own sayings respecting the manner of his death. It became the act of Pilate, with the approval of Herod; thus uniting with the ecclesiastical rulers of the Jews their own civil authority and the supreme power of Rome—a concurrence of the representatives of all the world⁵⁸—and securing the infliction of that

⁵⁶ Matt. xxii. 59-63; Mark xiv. 55-61. The account seems to imply some sort of cross-examination, which we may suppose to have been conducted by those who still maintained the sense of fairness, of which Gamaliel afterward gave an example, if, as seems most probable, Nicodemus and the other secret friends of Christ were afraid to interfere.

⁵⁷ Matt. xxvi. 63-68; Mark xiv. 61-65; Luke xxii. 67-71, and 63-65: comp. Is. l. 6, liii. 7. The *οὐ εἶπας* ("thou hast spoken the truth") of Matthew is a Greek idiom of not less emphatic assent than the *ἐγώ εἰμι* of Mark. Both are united in the phrase of Luke, *ὁμῆτε λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*.

⁵⁸ Comp. Ps. ii.

form of death, the most ignominious as well as painful, which could best mark God's wrath against sin,⁶⁰ and which, as especially the punishment of a slave, showed the Saviour descending to the lowest depths of humiliation, as a proof that he would save the most degraded.

They led him to the *Prætorium*,⁶¹ where the Roman procurator, PONTIUS PILATE, had just taken his seat early in the morning; but, as they could not enter a court inaugurated by heathen sacrifices without incurring a pollution that would have prevented their keeping the feast,⁶¹ Pilate came out to ask them the charge on which they delivered up the prisoner. They only replied that he was a malefactor; and Pilate gave them leave to deal with him according to their law. But they declined the responsibility, and charged him with the political offense of forbidding the people to pay tribute to Cæsar (the very trap into which they had vainly tried to draw him), and making himself a king, a claim which they alone had desired him to make in a form hostile to the emperor. Armed with this definite charge, and of course knowing nothing of a spiritual kingdom, Pilate went back to the *Prætorium* and began his examination by asking, "Art thou King of the Jews?" Jesus replied that his kingdom was not of this world, as the peaceful conduct of his disciples proved; and, when further pressed with the question, "Art thou a king then?"—he explained his kingdom to consist in bearing witness to the truth, and claimed the allegiance of every one who was himself true. To this appeal, Pilate made the often quoted rejoinder, "What is truth?"—a question perhaps expressing the contempt of a Roman for speculation on moral subjects, but not uttered in the "jesting" spirit ascribed to it by Bacon. It is true that he "stayed not for a reply," and he left the *Prætorium*, to tell the Jews that he found no fault in the accused. He seems to have brought Jesus out with the intention of dismissing him; but the priests and elders began

⁶⁰ The best expositors, both ancient and modern, have found also in the lingering death of the cross a type of the slow extinction of that sinful nature in the Christian, which St. Paul so often represents.

⁶¹ The *Prætorium*, translated in the A. V. the "hall of judgment" (John xviii. 28), was the head-quarters of the Roman military governor, wherever he happened to be. In time of peace some one of the best buildings

of the city was selected for the purpose. The *Prætorium* of Pilate was either the palace of Herod, or the citadel called Antonia, close to the Temple. Respecting Pontius Pilate, see chap. v. pp. 107, 108.

⁶¹ John xviii. 28. The phrase "eat the passover" must here be taken in a general sense for the feast of unleavened bread; unless it refers to the *chagigah*, or voluntary thank-offering.

to upbraid him with new charges, declaring that he had stirred up all the people from Galilee to Jerusalem, to which he made no reply.⁶²

Catching at the mention of Galilee as the chief scene of his seditious teaching, Pilate resolved to send him to Herod Antipas, who had come up to Jerusalem to the Passover — a practice by which he was accustomed to conciliate the Jews.⁶³ Herod rejoiced at obtaining the interview which he had long sought in vain, and put many questions to Jesus, in the hope of his working some miracle. Provoked, however, at receiving no answer, and seeing the vehemence of Christ's accusers, Herod with his soldiers made a mockery of his regal claims, and sent him back to Pilate arrayed in the imperial purple. The occasion was seized for a reconciliation between the king and the procurator, who had been long at variance, and the words of David were fulfilled, "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers took counsel together, against the Lord and against his anointed."⁶⁴

Finding himself compelled to decide the case, Pilate tried an appeal to the generous feelings of the people. It was a customary act of grace, in honor of the Passover, for the Roman governor to release some prisoner, whom the people chose. Knowing that the charge against Jesus sprang from the envy of the priests, and that the people had shown such enthusiasm for Christ, he proposed to release him whom they had so lately hailed as their King. But the plan was defeated by a cunning manœuvre of the priests. There was another prisoner, named BARABBAS, a murderer and robber, and the leader of one of those insurrections against the Roman government, which were frequent during the later days of Judæa. The feelings of the people were easily inflamed on behalf of this patriot brigand; and they probably saw by this time that Jesus was not about to fulfill their hopes of a miraculous restoration of David's kingdom. Pilate awaited their decision with an anxiety the more intense, because while sitting on the tribunal he received a warning message from his wife, who had just awakened from a harassing dream about the "just man." He repeated the question, "Which of the two shall I release to you?" and they replied, "Not this man, but Barabbas!" Again he tried to bring them to reason, and to revive their interest in Christ, by asking, "What will ye then

⁶² Matt. xxvii. 1, 2, 11, 14; Mark xv. 1-5; Luke xxiii. 1-5; John xviii. 28-38: comp. I. l. liii. 7.

⁶³ Comp. chap. v. § 8.

⁶⁴ Luke xxiii. 4-12; Ps. ii. 1, 2; comp. Acts iv. 25, 26.

that I shall do to him *whom ye call the King of the Jews?*" The answer was ready, "*Crucify him.*" Still Pilate made a third appeal—"Why, what evil hath he done?" and, again declaring that he found no fault in him, he proposed the strange compromise, to scourge him and let him go! But by this time the people, always ready for sedition, and continually prompted by the priests, were roused by the show of opposition to one of those tumults which were sure to bring disgrace on a Roman governor. The loud cries of "*Crucify him!*" prevailed over reason and conscience; and Pilate released Barabbas, and yielded up Jesus to their will.

But first a ceremony was enacted between the governor and the Jews, vain on his part, but of awful significance on theirs! Pilate washed his hands before the people, protesting "*I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it;*" and they accepted the tremendous responsibility:—"His blood be on us and on our children."⁶⁶ That responsibility they were afterward as eager to disclaim;⁶⁷ but the curse of his innocent blood still works upon their scattered race, only to be expiated when their faith "*brings this man's blood upon them*" as an atonement.

Jesus was now handed over to the Roman soldiers, whose brutality was inflamed with contempt for the peasant king of the despised Jews. To the torture of the scourging which preceded crucifixion were added the mockery of the crown of thorns,⁶⁸ the purple robe, and the reed for a sceptre, while the soldiers mingled their parody of the forms of homage with blows and spitting in his face.

The scene seems to have suggested to Pilate one more effort to save Jesus, in which, if unsuccessful, he would at least indulge his levity by an insult to the Jews. As a proof

⁶⁶ Matt. xxvii. 15-26; Mark xv. 6-15; Luke xxiii. 13-25; John xviii. 39, 40.

⁶⁷ Acts v. 28.

⁶⁸ Στέφανος ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, Matt. xxvii. 29. The Rhamnus or Spina Christi, although abundant in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, can not be the plant intended, because its thorns are so strong and large that it could not have been woven (πλέξαντες) into a wreath. The large-leaved acanthus (bear's foot) is totally unsuited for the purpose. Had the acacia been intended, as some suppose, the

phrase would have been ἐξ ἀκάνθης. Obviously some small flexible thorny shrub is meant; perhaps *cappares spinosa*. Hasselquist (*Travels*, p. 260) says that the thorn used was the Arabian *Nabk*. "It was very suitable for their purpose, as it has many sharp thorns which inflict painful wounds; and its flexible, pliant, and round branches might easily be plaited in the form of a crown." It also resembles the rich dark green of the triumphal ivy-wreath, which would give additional pungency to its ironical purpose.

that he believed him innocent, he brought him out and showed him invested with the insignia of royalty! But the insult excited rage and not compassion, and the cry was again, "Crucify him!" "Take ye him and crucify him; for I find no fault in him," rejoined Pilate, knowing that they dared not take him at his word; while they cried that he deserved death according to their law, because he made himself the Son of God.

Pilate's reluctance had for some time shown a mixture of superstitious fear, which these words raised to the highest pitch. Leading Jesus back into the hall, he asked him, "Whence art thou?" but he received no answer. When he urged the question by speaking of his power to crucify or to release him, Jesus told him that he could have no power at all over him unless it were given him from above, and with divine authority pronounced the guilt of his betrayers the greater. Pilate was now determined, if possible, to release him; but the Jews knew how to work upon a fear more present to him than that of the last judgment:—"If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend." The dread of being denounced to Tiberius for acquitting an usurper was decisive to his weak and selfish spirit. Leaving the Prætorium, and planting the *Bema* or judgment-seat in the open place called *Gabbatha* (the *pavement*),⁶⁸ in full view of the Temple and the people, Pilate passed sentence on Him whom he had so often declared innocent, and of whose right to be his judge he was not unaware. Still venting the reproaches of his conscience in insults on his instigators, he again said to the Jews, "Behold your King!" "Away with him! crucify him!" was still the answer. And when he asked, "Shall I crucify your *King*?"—the chief priests, in their rage, abjured the independence which was the strongest passion of a Jew, "We have no king but Cæsar."⁶⁹

The providence of God took them at their word, when their last efforts for freedom ended in their dispersion over all the world. No less signal was the retribution which befell the other actors in this greatest crime of the world's history. The unjust judge, whose reluctance was the measure of his

⁶⁸ John xix. 18. This was a paved platform on the ridge of the rock between the castle of Antonia and the western corner of the Temple. It has been supposed by some that the "pavement" (λιθόστρωτον) was some mosaic or tessellated work, upon which the bema was placed, perhaps some such work as that which we are told by Suetonius (*Cæsar*, 46) Julius Cæsar was accustomed to carry with him on his expeditions.

⁶⁹ Matt. xxvii. 26-30; Mark xv. 15-19; John xix. 1-16.

conscious guilt, soon incurred the very displeasure the fear of which urged him to the crime, and, like Judas, put an end to his own life."⁷⁰ There was no delay in the fate of the arch-traitor himself. Remorse seized him as soon as he saw that Jesus was condemned, an end which he had probably expected to see averted by the people or the governor, so that he might have enjoyed the reward of his treason, without its involving his Master's death. He now carried back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests, and confessed his sin, hoping perhaps that good might yet be done by this assertion of Christ's innocence. Their only answer was to throw the responsibility upon him; and, casting down the money on the pavement of the Temple, he went and hanged himself. His death was made more horrible to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem by the circumstance recorded by St. Luke in the *Acts*; but most awful of all is the sentence which was more than once pronounced upon him by the Lord, and with which Peter dismisses his name from the Apostles' list, "from which Judas by transgression fell, that *he might go to his own place*." With a scrupulousness which is the most striking example of religious formalism glossing over moral deformity, the chief priests decided that the thirty silver pieces, as the price of blood, must not be put back into the treasury, so they purchased with them the potter's field without the city, as a burial place for strangers, thereby fulfilling to the very letter a prophecy of Zechariah."⁷¹ It seems to be implied in the narrative that the field thus purchased was also the place where Judas committed suicide, and the double memorial of the scene and the price of blood was preserved by its name, *Acel-dama* (*the field of blood*)."⁷²

⁷⁰ See chap. v. p. 109.

⁷¹ Zech. xi. 12, foll. The reading "Jeremiah," in Matt. xxvii. 9, is probably a gloss. There is evidence, both in MSS. and versions, especially the very ancient Syriac, that "the prophet" alone was the original reading.

⁷² Matt. xxvii. 3-10; Acts i. 18, 19. It is hardly necessary to point out that "purchased" in the latter passage is an instance of a common figure of speech, implying indirect agency. The "field of blood" is now shown on the steep southern face of the valley or ravine of Hinnom, near its eastern end, on a narrow

plateau, more than half-way up the hill-side. Its modern name is *Hak ed-damm*. It is separated by no enclosure; a few venerable olive-trees occupy part of it, and the rest is covered by a ruined square edifice—half built, half excavated—which, perhaps originally a church, was in Maundrell's time in use as a charnel-house. It was believed in the Middle Ages that the soil of this place had the power of very rapidly consuming bodies buried in it, and in consequence either of this or of the sanctity of the spot, great quantities of the earth were taken away; among others by the Pisan Crusaders in 1218 for

§ 16. That great sacrifice was meanwhile accomplished, which no uninspired pen would dare to relate, were it not necessary to gather up in one view, and in some points to explain, the several statements of the Evangelists. The points that require notice are, the *manner* and *place* and *time* of the execution, the *incidents* that marked it, and the *sayings* which our Saviour uttered from the cross.⁷² It was a Roman execution, conducted in the usual forms of crucifixion, but with some important variations. The scourging had already been inflicted, and Jesus was now clothed by the soldiers with his own garments, of which more presently, in place of the purple robe of mock royalty, and was led forth from the city to the place of public execution. This was necessarily without the city, but it was evidently near to one of the gates, and beside a public road. Such is the sum of our knowledge, and there is no mention of its being on a hill. Its Hebrew name, GOLGOTHA (the place of a skull), is interpreted by all four Evangelists by the equivalent Greek word *κρανίον*, which is duly rendered in the Vulgate, in each case, *calvaria*; but, with that capricious variety which is one of its chief blots, our Version gives us only in St. Luke the word *Calvary*, which has so long been the key-note of the most sacred associations of thought and feeling.⁷³

One ignominious feature of crucifixion, the criminal's carrying his own cross to the place of execution, was not omitted in the case of Jesus, as we learn from St. John; but the other three Evangelists state that the soldiers laid the burden upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, who happened to be coming into Jerusalem from the country. The obvious reconciliation is that so often presented to the eye by great painters, that our Saviour, exhausted by his previous agony, sunk beneath the weight, which no one else would defile himself by lifting. The enforced service seems to have brought upon Simon the blessing pronounced by Christ on those who, in a spiritual sense, take up the cross and follow him; for St. Mark speaks of Simon and his sons, Alexander and Rufus, as persons well

their *Campo Santo* at Pisa, and by the Empress Helena for that at Rome. Besides the charnel-house above mentioned, there are several large hollows in the ground in this immediate neighborhood, which may have been caused by such excavations. The formation of the hill is cretaceous, and it is well known that chalk is al-

ways favorable to the rapid decay of animal matter.

⁷³ The interesting but somewhat dangerous field of symbolical interpretation can scarcely be entered upon here.

⁷⁴ The popular expression "*Mount Calvary*" has nothing in either of the Gospels to support it.

known in the Church. The procession was followed by a multitude, among whom were many women lamenting him; but he bade them weep not for him, but for the fearful troubles that were coming on the land. That no circumstance of disgrace might be wanting to bring the substitute for sinners down to the lowest level of those for whom he died, two common and probably atrocious criminals were led with him to death, as the prophet had foretold.

Arrived at the place of execution, the condemned were stripped and fastened to the cross, which was usually of the form familiar to us under the name of the Roman cross;⁷⁶ but not nearly so high as is commonly represented. The feet of the sufferer were only a foot or two above the ground—a fact of some weight, as showing that Jesus suffered in the midst of his persecutors, and not looking down from above their heads. The body was either nailed or bound by cords to the cross, or in both ways. Our Lord was nailed, both by the hands and feet, as the prophets had foretold;⁷⁷ a method more exquisitely painful at first, though tending to shorten the torture. When the cross was already standing, the sufferer was raised up and affixed to it; but otherwise, as in our Saviour's case, he was fastened to it as it lay upon the ground, and the shock when it was dropped into the hole or socket must have been terrible. To deaden the sense of these tortures, a soporific was usually administered; but our Lord refused the mixture of wine and myrrh thus offered him, probably for a reason already noticed.⁷⁸ He still observed the meek silence which Isaiah had foretold, till all the horrid details were accomplished, and he hung upon the cross between the two malefactors, on his right and on his left; being thus emphat-

⁷⁶ That is the form of †, the two pieces being unequal, as distinguished from the Greek cross, +, with equal arms, and the diagonal or “St. Andrew's cross,” ×; not to mention ornamented forms. See *Notes and Illustrations* (C).

⁷⁷ Ps. xxii. 16; Zech. xii. 10; John xx. 25, 27, etc. : comp. Rev. i. 7, the latter passage referring to all his wounds.

⁷⁸ Mark xv. 23. In the parallel passage of Matthew (xxvii. 34) it is “vinegar mingled with gall;” but the same drink might easily be called either vinegar or wine, since it was the thin acid wine, usually drunk by the Roman soldiers, and which was offered to our Saviour at a later period of his sufferings. (See below, note 88). There is more difficulty as to the “gall” and the “myrrh.” The term *χολή*, “gall,” may well have been applied to some soporific substance, and may have been used by St. Matthew, who writes with a constant view to the prophecies of the Old Testament, to mark the fulfilment of the prediction in Ps. lxxix. 21: “They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.” The exact soporific ingredient appears to have been myrrh, as we see from St. Mark.

ically "numbered with the transgressors."⁷⁸ It was then that he uttered the first of the seven sayings, which have ever been revered as his dying words, a prayer for his murderers—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."⁷⁹

St. Mark gives us the *time* of our Saviour's crucifixion, the *third hour* (or 9 o'clock A.M.),⁸⁰ the very time when the morning sacrifice was offered. All the three first Evangelists agree in placing his death at the 9th hour, which was the time of the evening sacrifice; the whole space of six hours being divided at noon by the beginning of the miraculous darkness. The apparent discrepancy with the statement of St. John, that it was about the *sixth hour* when Pilate condemned him, is explained by supposing that St. John's reckoning is from midnight, and that the intervening time (6-9 A.M.) was occupied in preparations.⁸¹

The execution was carried out, and the cross watched, by a guard of four soldiers, with a centurion; and the garments of the sufferers were their perquisite. Four parts being made, there remained the upper robe, woven throughout without a seam, the type of Christ's perfect righteousness, and the source of healing to many who had touched it. As it would have been spoiled by dividing it, the soldiers decided to cast lots for it, thus fulfilling another prophecy: "They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots."⁸²

The custom of writing up the culprit's crime on a scroll above his head gave Pilate another opportunity of mortifying the Jews, while bearing unconscious witness to the truth. To avoid all ambiguity, he wrote the title in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, a fact which forbids our explaining the various readings of the Evangelists by translation, and leaves this a decisive proof that their inspiration did not preclude varieties of expression, even in quoting important documents. They give it in the following forms:

"THIS IS JESUS, THE KING OF THE JEWS" (Matthew).

"THE KING OF THE JEWS" (Mark).

"THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS" (Luke).

"JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS" (John).

That the last was the exact form may be safely inferred from St. John's presence at the cross, where the words were before

⁷⁸ Is. liii. 12; Mark xv. 28.

⁷⁹ Luke xxiii. 34.

⁸⁰ Mark xv. 24-28.

⁸¹ John xix. 14; where, however, the Codex Bezae and another MS. of high value read the third hour. The view mentioned above is maintained

by Wieseler, *Chron. Syn.*, pp. 410-414.

⁸² Ps. xxii. 18; John xix. 23, 24.

This has given occasion to the remark, that Christians have, in their party divisions, paid less respect to their Master than the heathen soldiers did.

his eyes for all that memorable six hours, and from his care to specify the languages in which it was written. And who but a slave to the letter on the one hand, or a sceptic predetermined to wrest every difference into a contradiction on the other, would for a moment doubt that the other three Evangelists, intent only on recording the real point of the inscription, were content to give its general sense—"The KING OF THE JEWS?" Pilate's shaft did not miss his mark. The chief priests wished him to amend the description thus: "*He said, I am King of the Jews;*" but he silenced them with the answer, "What I have written I have written."⁸³

§ 17. For the first three hours (9-12 A.M.), Jesus hung upon the cross, exposed to all the insults of the rulers, and of the rabble whose cries had changed with his change of fortune. Some stood to enjoy the sight; while others, passing in and out of the neighboring city-gate, wagged their heads, and taunted him with the very prophecy which was being fulfilled—the destruction of the temple of his body, that it might be raised again in three days. A strong temptation was added to these taunts. He was challenged to prove his divine power and kingdom by coming down from the cross: nay, even the chief priests offered to believe him on that sign, though they disbelieved the still higher proof given by his resurrection. Of the very culprits who hung beside him, one joined in the railing, and dared to demand their deliverance and his as a proof that he was the Christ. But the other reproved his comrade's madness, confessing the justice of their sentence, and bearing witness to Christ's innocence, and then turned to him with the prayer, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Jesus opened his lips for the second time with these words, which at once assure the penitent sinner that "He is able to save even to the uttermost," and the dying believer that to be "absent from the body" is to be "present with the Lord" in immediate bliss:—"Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise."⁸⁴ Thus did Jesus, even on the cross, anticipate, in the case of these two types of sinners, the sentence he will pass on those who

⁸³ Matt. xxvii. 31-38; Mark xv. 20-28; Luke xxiii. 26-34, 38; John xix. 17-24.

⁸⁴ Matt. xxvii. 39-44; Mark xv. 29-32; Luke xxiii. 35-37, 39-43. The bearing of these last words on the great question of the state of departed spirits between death and the resur-

rection can not be discussed here. The statement of Matthew and Mark, that the malefactors reviled him, is easily explained by the indefinite use of the plural. It is of course possible that both joined, *at first*, in the same insults; but this seems hardly consistent with Luke's minute account.

stand on the right and on the left hand of his judgment-seat.

Having thus forgiven his persecutors, and blessed the penitent sinner, our Lord spoke for the third time, in tender care of those dear to him on earth. Three women, with the beloved disciple, had dared to stay by his cross. They were "the three Marys;" his mother; her sister, the wife of Clopas;⁸⁵ and Mary of Magdala. With filial love, even in that hour of agony, he bade his mother behold a son in the beloved disciple, and that disciple to look upon her as his mother; and henceforward Mary found a home with John.⁸⁶

It was now noon, but such a noon as had never been seen in Judæa. The position of the Paschal full moon precluded the possibility of a solar eclipse; and yet a supernatural darkness rested upon all the land, from the 6th hour to the 9th hour, as if to veil the last agonies of the Redeemer from the eyes of men. But far deeper than that darkness was the gloom that weighed upon the Saviour's soul, as he bore the whole burden of the divine wrath for the sins of all men. To that awful mystery our only guide is in the words, with which at the ninth hour he broke the solemn silence, "My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?" words already used prophetically by David in the great Psalm which describes the Messiah's sufferings—words which never since have been, nor ever will be again, wrung from any human being, except through sinful despondency or final impenitent despair; for he endured his Father's desertion that we might never have to bear it. Their sense was lost upon the by-standers, who, remembering the connection of the promised Elijah with Christ, caught at the sound of the word "Eli" (*My God*) as a call for the prophet.⁸⁷ At this moment the sufferer's mortal frame endured its last agony of intense thirst, and, to fulfill one more prophecy he exclaimed, "I thirst." One of the by-standers filled a sponge from a vessel standing near, with the mixture of acid wine and water which was the common drink of the Roman soldiers,⁸⁸ and lifting it on a stalk of hyssop, put it to his mouth, while the rest said, "Let us see if Elijah will come

⁸⁵ This, and not *Cleophas*, is the true reading. The name is properly represented by the Greek *Alphæus*; and the *Cleopas* of Luke xxiv. 18 is a Greek name, belonging to a different person.

⁸⁶ John xix. 25-27. It may be inferred that Joseph, the husband of Mary, was no longer living.

⁸⁷ The "Eli" of Matthew is the Hebrew form, the "Eloi" of Mark the Aramaic.

⁸⁸ The thin sour wine of the Roman soldiers was called *acetum* or *posca*, when mixed with water. This must not be confounded with the soporific previously offered to our Lord. See note 77.

to help him."^{88b} Though offered in derision, it was doubtless refreshing to his sinking frame.

And now all that man could inflict had been endured; all that the Son of God could do and bear for man had been done and suffered. The end of his agony and the completion of his redeeming work are both announced by the loud cry, "It is FINISHED;" the soul which had animated his mortal body is yielded back to God with those words of perfect resignation, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit;"⁸⁹ and, bowing his head upon his breast, he expired.⁹⁰

Separate as the divine sufferer was from all other men in the nature and purpose of his sacrificial death, the spirit with which, as a man, he yielded up his life is none the less a model for his disciples. His prayer for the forgiveness of his murderers, and his resignation of his spirit to God, were repeated, almost in the same words, by the first Christian martyr, Stephen; and it has ever been the great desire of his followers to die, as he died, in charity with man, in affection to their kindred, and in resignation to God's will. Like him, too, they put off the body of sin and death forever, and cease from their works as he did from his; in the firm belief that, if we be dead with Christ, we shall also live with him.⁹¹

His death was followed by portents not to be overlooked by any of the multitudes assembled at Jerusalem, and forming irrefragable evidence for all future time. The priest, who entered the Holy Place at this very hour, with the blood of the evening sacrifice, saw the veil rent in twain from the top to the bottom. That veil was the special, as the Temple itself was a more general, symbol of Christ's body, the visible covering which enshrined the abode of deity; and the one was rent, and the other broken, to show that "a new and living way was consecrated for us to enter into the Holiest of all, by the blood of Jesus, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh."⁹² The rocks which surrounded Jerusalem were rent with a great earthquake, and the graves were opened, to show that his

^{88b} It is still believed that drinking causes the death of impaled persons, and water is withheld to prolong their sufferings.

⁸⁹ Literally, *place it as a deposit*, the same word of which St. Paul uses the cognate noun in the celebrated passage, 2 Tim. i. 12.

⁹⁰ Matt. xxvii. 45-50; Mark xv. 33-37; Luke xxiii. 44-46; John xix. 28-30. It deserves notice that, in

the last words, Matthew and Mark mention only the *loud cry*, Luke the prayer of resignation, and John the proclamation, "It is finished."—In *Notes and Illustrations* (C) an account is given of the Roman punishment of crucifixion, which illustrates many of the details mentioned in the text.

⁹¹ See Rom. vi. 2-13.

⁹² Heb. x. 19, foll.

death was the beginning of new life; and many of the saints, those perhaps who had lately died in the faith of his speedy coming, rose and were seen by many in the city after his resurrection.⁹³ Even such wonders were not enough to break down the stubborn spirit of the Jews; they had to wait for the stronger influences of the Holy Spirit; and, at the most, they departed with deep feelings of wondering grief. But the Roman centurion saw enough in the manner of Christ's death, and in his expiring words, to make him glorify God by the confession, "Truly this was a just man! Truly this was the Son of God!" The most attached of his friends, including the devoted women who followed him from Galilee, only ventured to view the scene from a distance.⁹⁴

§ 18. The day was now drawing to a close, and at sunset the Sabbath would begin.⁹⁵ "That Sabbath day was a high day;" especially as being the *second day* of the feast of unleavened bread, when the first-fruits of the harvest were offered in the Temple, and whence the fifty days were reckoned to the Day of Pentecost. For that Sabbath this day itself was the "preparation." This statement, twice made by St. John, has caused much debate; but it seems to refer simply to the custom of preparing for any sacred festival on the previous day. On this "preparation day" especially, they would put away all pollutions and signs of mourning that might mar the coming feast. So, though they had not scrupled to enact on it a deed which would have profaned any day, they could not endure its defilement by the consequences of their judicial murder. Pilate readily granted their request, that the sufferings of the crucified might be ended by breaking their legs (for to dispatch them with the sword was deemed too honorable), and that they might be buried.⁹⁶ This was done to the two malefactors; but as Christ was found to be dead already, his limbs were left unbroken. To make sure, however, of his death, one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear; and blood and water were seen to flow mingled from the wound. Thus was fulfilled both the prophetic ordinance of the true Paschal Lamb, "A bone of him shall not be broken," and that other prophecy, "They shall look on him whom they pierced."⁹⁷

Most justly does St. John lay the utmost stress on the

⁹³ Matt. xxvii. 51-54; Mark xv. 38; Luke xxiii. 45.

⁹⁴ Matt. xxvii. 51-56.

⁹⁵ The sunset, at a time so near the equinox, was of course soon after 6 P.M.

⁹⁶ The Romans generally allowed

the body to rot upon the cross; but in consequence of Deut. xxi. 22, 23, an express national exception was made in favor of the Jews.

⁹⁷ John xix. 31-42: comp. Ex. xii. 46; Ps. xxxiv. 20; Zech. xxi. 10; Ps. xx. 16, 17; Rev. i. 7.

truth of his testimony, as an eye-witness, to this incident, not only for the spiritual sense which he afterward gave it,^{97b} but as the very turning-point on which the credibility of the Gospel rests. It established beyond a doubt the reality of Christ's death, without full proof of which the evidence of his resurrection would always have been questionable. And the matter was put beyond all dispute by the care of Pilate to ascertain from the centurion the truth of a death so unusually speedy.⁹⁸ The tortures of crucifixion were often prolonged three days, and even more; but the exhaustion of our Saviour's toil-worn frame, by his night of agony, and by his inexpressible mental anguish on the cross, are causes adequate to explain his dying in six hours; while the abundant flow of lymph and blood, due to the piercing of the pericardium, makes it probable that he died literally of "a broken heart."⁹⁹

§ 19. Meanwhile JOSEPH of Arimathæa, a rich man and a member of the Sanhedrim, who had been no party to their councils against Jesus, now boldly avowed his secret discipleship by coming to Pilate and begging the body of Jesus. Pilate consented, as soon as he had satisfied himself of the real death. Joseph's example gave courage to Nicodemus, who brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes to anoint the corpse; even as the Jewish kings used to be buried in spices. The near approach of the Sabbath left no time for the final funeral ceremonies. They took down the body from the cross; and wrapping it hastily in linen, with the spices, they laid it in a new rock-hewn sepulchre, which Joseph had made for himself, in a garden close at hand. To secure the sepulchre during the Sabbath, they rolled a great stone against its door, and departed. Thus was the prophecy fulfilled, that the Messiah should "make his grave with the rich."¹⁰⁰ Mary Magdalene, and Mary the sister of Christ's mother, who had sat opposite the sepulchre during the burial, and had seen how the body was laid in it,¹⁰¹ went home, postponing the preparation of their spices and ointments for the full performance of the funeral rites till after the Sabbath; and then "they rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." The mother of Jesus seems to have been led home from the cross, when the body was taken down, by John, her new-found son.¹⁰²

^{97b} 1 John v. 6, 8.

⁹⁸ Mark xv. 44, 45.

⁹⁹ This is ably maintained in the work of Dr. Stroud, *On the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*.

¹⁰⁰ Is. liii. 9.

¹⁰¹ Hence they were prepared to see at once that Jesus had left the sepulchre.

¹⁰² Matt. xxvii. 57-61; Mark xv. 42-47; Luke xxiii. 50-56; John xix. 38-42.

§ 20. The *Sabbath day* (EASTER EVE) : *Saturday, the 16th of Nisan (April 7th), from the preceding sunset.*—The sacred narrative leaves the disciples in the overwhelming grief and desolation amid which they kept this Sabbath; having, as we may infer from the events of the next day, re-assembled from their dispersion, and looking forward, though with only the faintest hope, to the third day, on which Jesus had foretold his resurrection.¹⁰³ The chief priests and Pharisees also remembered the prediction with alarm, and on the pretense that his disciples might steal away the body, they obtained Pilate's permission to set a watch of soldiers over the tomb, saw that it was securely shut, and sealed the stone.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ See Luke xxiv. 21.

¹⁰⁴ Matt. xxvii. 62-66. On the site of the Sepulchre, see *Notes and Illustrations* (D).

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.

THE "Mount of Olives" (τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν) is the usual form of the name in the N. T.; but in Acts i. 12 we find it called "the mount called Olivet" (ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν), the word *Olivet* being borrowed from the Latin *Olivetum*, which is a translation of ἐλαιῶν, signifying a place where olives grow, an olive-garden or olive-yard. St. Luke uses the form ἐλαιῶν in two other passages (Luke xix. 29, xxi. 37) but the received text erroneously reads ἐλαιῶν, "of olives," which is followed in the Authorized Version.

The Mount of Olives is the well-known eminence on the east of Jerusalem. It is, however, not so much a "mount" as a ridge, of rather more than a mile in length, running in general direction north and south; covering the whole eastern side of the city. At its northern end the ridge

bends round to the west, so as to form an enclosure to the city on that side also. But there is this difference, that whereas on the north a space of nearly a mile of tolerably level surface intervenes between the walls of the city and the rising ground, on the east the mount is close to the walls, parted only by that which from the city itself seems no parting at all—the narrow ravine of the Kidron. It is this portion which is the real Mount of Olives of the history. The northern part is, though geologically continuous, a distinct mountain. We will therefore confine ourselves to this portion. In general height it is not very much above the city: 300 feet higher than the Temple Mount, hardly more than 100 above the so-called Zion. The word "ridge" has been used above as the only one available for an eminence of some length and even height, but that word is hardly accurate. There is nothing "ridge.

like " in the appearance of the Mount of Olives, or of any other of the limestone hills of this district of Palestine; all is rounded, swelling, and regular in form. At a distance its outline is almost horizontal, gradually sloping away at its southern end; but when seen from below the eastern wall of Jerusalem, it divides itself into three, or rather perhaps four, independent summits or eminences. Proceeding from north to south these occur in the following order:—Galilee, or Viri Galilæi; Mount of the Ascension; Prophets, subordinate to the last and almost a part of it; Mount of Offense.

I. Of these the central one, MOUNT OF THE ASCENSION, distinguished by the minaret and domes of the Church of the Ascension, is in every way the most important. Three paths lead from the valley to the summit (see the drawing on p. 347) The first passes under the north wall of the enclosure of Gethsemane, and follows the line of the depression between the centre and the northern hill. The second parts from the first about 50 yards beyond Gethsemane, and striking off to the right up the very breast of the hill, surmounts the projection on which is the traditional spot of the Lamentation over Jerusalem, and thence proceeds directly upward to the village. The third leaves the other two at the N.E. corner of Gethsemane, and making a considerable detour to the south, visits the so-called "Tombs of the Prophets," and, following a very slight depression which occurs at that part of the mount, arrives in its turn at the village. Of these three paths the first, from the fact that it follows the natural shape of the ground, is unquestionably older than the others, which deviate in pursuit of certain artificial objects. Every consideration is in favor of its being the road usually taken by our Lord and his disciples in their morning

and evening transit between Jerusalem and Bethany, and that also by which the Apostles returned to Jerusalem after the Ascension. The central hill, which we are now considering, purports to contain the sites of some of the most sacred and impressive events of Christian history. During the Middle Ages most of these were protected by an edifice of some sort; and to judge from the reports of the early travelers, the mount must at one time have been thickly covered with churches and convents. The majority of these sacred spots now command little or no attention; but three still remain, sufficiently sacred—if authentic—to consecrate any place. These are: 1. Gethsemane, at the foot of the mount. 2. The spot from which our Saviour ascended, on the summit. 3. The place of the Lamentation of Christ over Jerusalem, half-way up.

1. Of these, Gethsemane is the only one which has any claim to be authentic. It was situated about $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ of a mile English from the walls of Jerusalem, between the brook Kedron and the foot of the mount. There was a "garden," or rather orchard (*κηπος*), attached to it, containing olive-trees, from which the place obtained its name (the *Oil-Press*). A modern garden, in which are 8 venerable olive-trees, and a grotto to the north, detached from it, and in closer connection with the Church of the Sepulchre of the Virgin, both securely enclosed, and under lock and key, are pointed out as making up the true Gethsemane. The largest of these trees is 6 yards round, and they are reckoned to be 2000 years old, so that they may have been contemporary with our Lord. But against this, it has been urged that Titus cut down all the trees round about Jerusalem; and certainly this is no more than Josephus states in express terms (*B. J.* vi. 1.

§ 1). The probability therefore would seem to be, that they were planted by Christian hands to mark the spot; unless, like the sacred olive of the Acropolis, they may have reproduced themselves. There are at present only 8 trees.

2. The first person who attached the Ascension of Christ to the Mount of Olives seems to have been the Empress Helena (A. D. 325). Eusebius states that she erected, as a memorial of that event, a sacred house of assembly on the highest part of the mount, where there was a cave which a sure tradition testified to be that in which the Saviour had imparted mysteries to his disciples. But neither this account, nor that of the same author when the cave is again mentioned, do more than name the Mount of Olives, generally, as the place from which Christ ascended: they fix no definite spot thereon. It took nearly three centuries to harden and narrow this general recognition of the connection of the Mount of Olives with Christ into an invention in contradiction of the Gospel narrative of the Ascension. For a contradiction it undoubtedly is. Two accounts of the Ascension exist, both by the same author—the one, Luke xxiv. 50, 51, the other Acts i. 6-11. The former only of these names the place at which our Lord ascended. That place was not the summit of the Mount, but Bethany—"He led them out as far as to Bethany"—on the eastern slopes of the Mount nearly a mile beyond the traditional spot. The narrative of the Acts does not name the scene of the occurrence, but it states that after it had taken place the Apostles "returned to Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath day's journey." It was their natural, their only route; but St. Luke is writing for Gentiles ignorant of the localities, and therefore he not

only names Olivet, but adds the general information that it—that is, the summit and main part of the mount—was a Sabbath day's journey from Jerusalem. The specification of the distance no more applies to Bethany on the further side of the mount than to Gethsemane on the nearer.

3. The third of the three traditional spots mentioned—that of the Lamentation over Jerusalem (Luke xix. 41-44)—is not more happily chosen than that of the Ascension. It is on a mamelon or protuberance which projects from the slope of the breast of the hill, about 300 yards above Gethsemane. The inappropriateness of this place has been noticed by many; but Dean Stanley was the first who gave it its death-blow, by pointing out the true spot to take its place. In a well-known passage of *Sinai and Palestine* (190-193), he shows that the road of our Lord's "Triumphal entry" must have been, not the short and steep path over the summit used by small parties of pedestrians, but the longer and easier route round the southern shoulder of the southern of the three divisions of the mount.

II. We have spoken of the central and principal portion of the mount. Next to it on the southern side, separated from it by a slight depression, up which the path mentioned above as the third takes its course, is a hill which appears neither to possess, nor to have possessed, any independent name. It is remarkable only for the fact that it contains the "singular catacomb" known as the TOMBS OF THE PROPHETS, probably in allusion to the words of Christ (Matt. xxiii. 29).

III. The most southern portion of the Mount of Olives is that usually known as the MOUNT OF OFFENSE, *Mons Offensionis*, though by the Arabs called *Baten el Hawa*, "the bag of the wind." It rises next to

that last mentioned; and in the hollow between the two, more marked than the depression between the more northern portions, runs the road from Bethany, which was without doubt the road of Christ's entry to Jerusalem. The title Mount of Offense, or of Scandal, was bestowed on the supposition that it is the "Mount of Corruption" on which Solomon erected the high places for the gods of his foreign wives (2 K. xxiii. 13; 1 K. xi. 7). The southern summit is considerably lower than the centre one, and it is much more definitely separated from the surrounding portions of the mountain than the others are. It is also sterner and more repulsive in its form.

IV. The only one of the four summits remaining to be considered is that on the north of the "Mount of Ascension"—the *Karem es Seyad*, or Vineyard of the Sportsman; or, as it is called by the modern Latin and Greek Christians, the *VIRI GALILÆI*. This is a hill of exactly the same character as the Mount of the Ascension, and so nearly its equal in height that few travelers agree as to which is the more lofty. The summits of the two are about 400 yards apart. It stands directly opposite the N.E. corner of Jerusalem, and is approached by the path between it and the Mount of Ascension, which strikes at the top into a cross-path leading to *et-Isawiyeh* and *Anata*. The Arabic name well reflects the fruitful character of the hill, on which there are several vineyards, besides much cultivation of other kinds. The Christian name is due to the singular tradition, that here the two angels addressed the Apostles after our Lord's ascension—"Ye men of Galilee!" This idea, which is so incompatible, on account of the distance, even with the traditional spot of the Ascension, is of late existence and inexplicable origin.

The presence of the crowd of churches and other edifices implied in the foregoing description must have rendered the Mount of Olives, during the early and middle ages of Christianity, entirely unlike what it was in the time of the Jewish kingdom or of our Lord. Except the high places on the summit, the only buildings then to be seen were probably the walls of the vineyards and gardens, and the towers and presses which were their invariable accompaniment. But though the churches are nearly all demolished, there must be a considerable difference between the aspect of the mountain now and in those days when it received its name from the abundance of its olive-groves. It does not now stand so pre-eminent in this respect among the hills in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. "It is only in the deeper and more secluded slope leading up to the northernmost summit that these venerable trees spread into any thing like a forest." The cedars commemorated by the Talmud have fared still worse: there is not one of them to be found within many miles.

Two religious ceremonies performed there must have done much to increase the numbers who resorted to the mount. The appearance of the new moon was probably watched for, certainly proclaimed, from the summit. The second ceremony referred to was the burning of the Red Heifer. This solemn ceremonial was enacted on the central mount, and in a spot so carefully specified that it would seem not difficult to fix it. It was due east of the sanctuary, and at such an elevation on the mount that the officiating priest as he slew the animal and sprinkled her blood, could see the façade of the sanctuary through the east gate of the Temple. To this spot a viaduct was constructed across the valley on a double row of arches, so as to raise it far above

all possible proximity with graves or other defilements. It was probably demolished by the Jews themselves on the approach of Titus, or even earlier, when Pompey led his army by Jericho and over the Mount of Olives. This would account satisfactorily for its not being alluded to by Josephus. "The lasting glory of the Mount of Olives," it has been well said, "belongs not to the Old Dispensation, but to the New. Its very barrenness of interest in earlier times sets forth the abundance of those associations which it derives from the closing scenes of the sacred history. Nothing, perhaps, brings before us more strikingly the contrast of Jewish and Christian feeling, the abrupt and inharmonious termination of the Jewish dispensation—if we exclude the culminating point of the Gospel history—than to contrast the blank which Olivet presents to the Jewish pilgrims of the Middle Ages, only dignified by the sacrifice of 'the red heifer;' and the vision too great for words, which it offers to the Christian traveler of all times, as the most detailed and the most authentic abiding-place of Jesus Christ. . . . It is useless to seek for traces of his presence in the streets of the since ten times captured city. It is impossible not to find them in the free space of the Mount of Olives" (Stanley, *Sin. and Pal.* 189).

(B.) THE PASCHAL SUPPER.

A general account of the Passover is given in the *Old Testament History*, App. pp. 215 foll. It is necessary to repeat here some particulars, in order to show its connection with the last Supper of our Lord.

The manner in which the Paschal feast was kept by the Jews at the time of our Lord differed in many details from that originally prescribed by the

rules of Ex. xii. The multitudes that came up to Jerusalem met, as they could find accommodation, family by family, or in groups of friends, with one of their number as the celebrant, or "proclaimer" of the feast. The ceremonies of the feast took place in the following order. (1) The members of the company that were joined for this purpose met in the evening and reclined on couches, this position being now as much a matter of rule as standing had been originally (comp. Matt. xxvi. 20, ἀνέκειτο; Luke xxii. 14; and John xiii. 23, 25). The head of the household, or celebrant, began by a form of blessing "for the day and for the wine," pronounced over a cup, of which he and the others then drank. The wine was, according to Rabbinic traditions, to be mixed with water; not for any mysterious reason, but because that was regarded as the best way of using the best wine (comp. 2 Macc. xv. 39). (2) All who were present then washed their hands; this also having a special benediction. (3) The table was then set out with the Paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs, and the dish known as *Charoseth*, a sauce made of dates, figs, raisins and vinegar, and designed to commemorate the mortar of their bondage in Egypt. (4) The celebrant first, and then the others, dipped a portion of the bitter herbs into the *Charoseth* and ate them. (5) The dishes were then removed, and a cup of wine again brought. Then followed an interval which was allowed theoretically for the questions that might be asked by children or proselytes, who were astonished at such a strange beginning of a feast, and the cup was passed round and drunk at the close of it. (6) The dishes being brought on again, the celebrant repeated the commemorative words which opened what was strictly the Paschal supper, and pronounced a solemn thanksgiving, followed by Pa. cxiii. and cxiv

(7) Then came a second washing of the hands, with a short form of blessing as before, and the celebrant broke one of the two loaves or cakes of unleavened bread, and gave thanks over it. All then took portions of the bread and dipped them, together with the bitter herbs, into the Charoseth, and so ate them. (8) After this they ate the flesh of the Paschal lamb, with bread, etc., as they liked; and after another blessing, a third cup, known especially as the "cup of blessing," was handed round. (9) This was succeeded by a fourth cup, and the recital of Ps. cxv.-cxviii., followed by a prayer, and this was accordingly known as the cup of the Hallel, or of the Song. (10) There might be, in conclusion, a fifth cup, provided that the "great Hallel" (possibly Psalms cxx.-cxxxvii.) was sung over it.

Comparing the ritual thus gathered from Rabbinic writers with the N. T., and assuming that it represents substantially the common practice of our Lord's time, and that the meal of which he and his disciples partook was the Passover, we are able to point, though not with absolute certainty, to the points of departure which the old practice presented for the institution of the new. To (1) or (3) or even to (8), we may refer the first words and the first distribution of the cup (Luke xxii. 17, 18); to (4) or (7), the dipping of the sop (*ψωμίον*) of John xiii. 26; to (7), or to an interval during or after (8) the distribution of the bread (Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24); to (9) or (10) ("after supper," Luke xxii. 20) the thanksgiving, and distribution of the cup, and the hymn with which the whole was ended. It will be noticed that, according to this order of succession, the question whether Judas partook of what, in the language of a later age, would be called the consecrated elements, is most probably to be answered in the negative.

In the preceding account we have assumed that the meal, at which our Lord instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist, was the Paschal supper. But this has been much disputed. If we had nothing to guide us but the three first Gospels, no doubt of the kind could well be raised, though the narratives may not be free from difficulties in themselves. We find them speaking, in accordance with Jewish usage, of the day of the supper as that on which "the Passover must be killed," and as "the first day of unleavened bread" (Matt. xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 7). Each relates that the use of the guest-chamber was secured in the manner usual with those who came from a distance to keep the festival. Each states that "they made ready the Passover," and that, when the evening was come, our Lord, taking the place of the head of the family, sat down with the Twelve. He himself distinctly calls the meal "this Passover" (Luke xxii. 15, 16). After a thanksgiving, he passes round the first cup of wine (Luke xxii. 17), and, when the supper is ended, the usual "cup of blessing" (comp. Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 25). A hymn is then sung (Matt. xxvi. 30; Mark xiv. 26), which it is reasonable to suppose was the last part of the Hallel.

But on the other hand, if we had no information but that which is to be gathered from St. John's Gospel, we should naturally infer that the evening of the supper was that of the 13th of Nisan, the day preceding that of the Paschal meal. It appears to be spoken of as occurring before the Feast of the Passover (xiii. 1, 2). Some of the disciples suppose that Christ told Judas, while they were at supper, to buy what they "had need of against the feast" (xiii. 29). In the night which follows the supper, the Jews will not enter the *l'prætorium*

lest they should be defiled and so not able to "eat the Passover" (xviii. 28). When our Lord is before Pilate, about to be led out to crucifixion, we are told that it was "the preparation of the Passover" (xix. 14). After the crucifixion, the Jews are solicitous, "because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, for that Sabbath day was a high day" (xix. 31).

We have to show that the passages in St. John may be fairly interpreted in such a manner as not to interfere with our own conclusion.

1. John xiii. 1, 2. *πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς*. The words are of doubtful extent; and we may regard the first verse as incomplete in itself, understanding its purport to be that "Before the Passover, in the prospect of his departure, the Saviour's love was actively called forth toward his followers, and he gave proof of his love to the last."

2. John xiii. 29. It is urged that the things of which they had "need against the feast" might have been the provisions for the Chagigah, perhaps with what else was required for the seven days of unleavened bread. The usual day for sacrificing the Chagigah was the 15th, which was then commencing.

3. John xviii. 28. The Jews refused to enter the Prætorium, lest they should be defiled and so disqualified from eating the Passover. The words may either be taken in a general sense as meaning "that they might go on keeping the Passover," or that *τὸ πάσχα* may be understood specifically to denote the Chagigah.

4. John xix. 14. "The preparation of the Passover" at first sight would seem as if it must be *the preparation for the Passover* on the 14th. But while there was a regular "preparation" for the Sabbath, there is no mention of any "preparation" for the festivals. It seems to be essen-

tially connected with the Sabbath itself (John xix. 31). The phrase in John xix. 14 may thus be understood as the preparation of the Sabbath which fell in the Passover week. Thus the day of the preparation mentioned in the Gospels might have fallen on the day of holy convocation, the 15th of Nisan.

5. John xix. 31. "That Sabbath day was a high day." Any Sabbath occurring in the Passover week might have been considered "a high day," as deriving an accession of dignity from the festival. But the special dignity of this day may have resulted from its being that on which the Omer was offered, and from which were reckoned the fifty days to Pentecost.

6 The difficulty of supposing that our Lord's apprehension, trial, and crucifixion took place on the day of holy convocation has been strongly urged. But we have better proof than either the Mishna or the Gemara can afford, that the Jews did not hesitate, in the time of the Roman domination, to carry arms and to apprehend a prisoner on a solemn feast-day. We find them at the Feast of Tabernacles, on the "great day of the feast," sending out officers to take our Lord, and rebuking them for not bringing him (John vii. 32-45). St. Peter also was seized during the Passover (Acts xii. 3, 4). And, again, the reason alleged by the rulers for not apprehending Jesus was, not the sanctity of the festival, but the fear of an uproar among the multitude which was assembled (Matt. xxvi. 5).

In fine, due weight should be given to the antecedent probability that the meal was no other than the regular Passover, and the reasonableness of the contrary view can not be maintained without some artificial theory, having no foundation either in Scripture or ancient testimony.

(C.) CRUCIFIXION.

The Romans unanimously considered crucifixion the most horrible form of death, worse even than burning, since the "cross" precedes "burning" in the law-books. Hence it is called *crudelissimum teterrimum-que supplicium* (Cic. *Verr.* v. 66), and to a Jew it would acquire factitious horror from the curse in Deut. xxi. 23. Among the Romans also the degradation was a part of the infliction, since it was especially a *servile* punishment, so that even a freedman ceased to dread it; or if applied to freemen, it was only in the case of the vilest criminals, thieves, etc. Indeed, exemption from it was the privilege of every Roman citizen.

The cross was of various forms, of which the following are the principal:

1. The *cruz simplex*, or mere stake "of one single piece without transom," was probably the original of the rest. The criminal was tied to the stake (*ad palum deligare*, Liv. xxvi. 13), from which he hung by his arms. Trees were naturally convenient for this purpose, and we read of their being applied to such use in the Martyrologies.
2. The *cruz decussata* is called St. Andrew's cross, although on no good grounds, since, according to some, he was killed with the sword. It was in the shape of the Greek letter X.
3. The *cruz commissa*, or St. Anthony's cross (so called from being embroidered on that saint's cope, Mrs. Jameson's *Sacred Art*, i. xxxv.), was in the shape of a T. This shape is often alluded to by the Fathers as "the mystical Tau."
4. The *cruz immissa* (or Latin cross) differed from the former by the projection of the upright above the cross-bar, and was in the form of †. That this was the kind of cross on which our Lord died is obvious from the mention of the "title," as placed

above our Lord's head, and from the almost unanimous tradition; it is repeatedly found on the coins and columns of Constantine. There was a projection from the central stem, on which the body of the sufferer rested. This was to prevent the weight of the body from tearing away the hands. Whether there was also a support to the feet (as we see in pictures), is doubtful. An inscription (*titulus* or *elogium*) was generally placed above the criminal's head, briefly expressing his guilt, and carried before him. It was covered with white gypsum, and the letters were black. It is a question whether tying or nailing to the cross was the more common method. That our Lord was *nailed*, according to prophecy, is certain (John xx. 25, 27, etc.; Zech. xii. 10; Ps. xxii. 16). It is, however, extremely probable that both methods were used at once.

The punishment commenced with scourging, after the criminal had been stripped; hence in the common form of sentence we find "summove, lictor, *despolia*, verbera," etc. (Liv. i. 26). It was inflicted not with the comparatively mild *virgæ*, but the more terrible *flagellum* (Hor. *Sat.* i. 3; 2 Cor. xi. 24, 25), which was not used by the Jews (Deut. xxv. 3). Into these scourges the soldiers often stuck nails, pieces of bone, etc., to heighten the pain. The scourging generally took place at a column, and the one to which our Lord was bound was seen by several of the Fathers, and is still shown at several churches among the relics. In our Lord's case, however, this infliction seems neither to have been the legal scourging after the sentence, nor yet the examination by torture (Acts xxii. 24), but rather a scourging *before* the sentence, to excite pity and procure immunity from further punishment (Luke xxiii. 22; John xix. 1); and if this view be correct, the scourging

in Matt. xxvii. 26 is retrospective, as so great an anguish could hardly have been endured *twice*. How severe it was is indicated in prophecy (Ps. xxv. 15; Is. l. 6). The scarlet robe, crown of thorns, and other insults to which our Lord was subjected were illegal, and arose from the spontaneous petulance of the brutal soldiery. The criminal carried his own cross, or at any rate a part of it. Hence the term *Furcifer*—cross-bearer. He was sometimes scourged and goaded on the way.

The place of execution was outside the city ("post urbem," Cic. *Verr.* v. 66; "extra portam," Plaut. *Mil. Gl.* ii. 4, 6; Acts vii. 58; Heb. xiii. 12; and in camps "extra vallum"), often in some public road or other conspicuous place like the Campus Martius, or some spot set apart for the purpose. Arrived at the place of execution, the sufferer was stripped naked, the dress being the perquisite of the soldiers (Matt. xxvii. 35); the cross was then driven into the ground, so that the feet of the condemned were a foot or two above the earth (in pictures of the crucifixion the cross is generally much too large and high), and he was lifted upon it, or else stretched upon it on the ground, and then lifted with it. Before the nailing or binding took place a medicated cup was given out of kindness, to confuse the senses and deaden the pangs of the sufferer. Our Lord refused it, that his senses might be clear (Matt. xxvii. 34; Mark xv. 23).

Our Lord, when crucified, was watched according to custom by a party of four soldiers (John xix. 23), whose express office was to prevent the stealing of the body. This was necessary from the lingering character of the death, which sometimes did not supervene even for three days, and was at last the result of gradual benumbing and starvation. But for

this guard, the persons might have been taken down and recovered, as was actually done in the case of a friend of Josephus (*Vit.* 75). Among the Convulsionnaires in the reign of Louis XV. women would be repeatedly crucified, and even remain on the cross three hours; the pain consisted almost entirely in the *nailing*, and not more than a basinful of blood was lost. Fracture of the legs was especially adopted by the Jews to hasten death (John xix. 31), and it was a mitigation of the punishment. Generally the body was suffered to rot on the cross, by the action of sun and rain, or to be devoured by birds and beasts. Sepulture was generally therefore forbidden, though it might be granted as a special favor or on grand occasions. But in consequence of Deut. xxi. 22, 23, an express national exception was made in favor of the Jews.

(D.) THE SITE OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

The site of the Holy Sepulchre has been a fruitful subject of controversy. Its discovery by Constantine is related by Eusebius, who tells us that certain impious persons had heaped earth upon the sacred cave and erected a temple of Venus upon the site; that Constantine caused the temple to be demolished and the earth to be removed; and that as soon as this was done, there appeared immediately beneath the covering of earth the cave in which our Saviour had been buried (Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii. 25-28).

This is not the place to give an account of the controversy. We can only mention the three principal views that have been held upon the subject.


1. The first of these theories maintains that the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which is situate in

the heart of the modern city, is the site of the actual sepulchre of our Lord. The first person who ventured publicly to express his dissent from this view was Korte, a German printer, who traveled in Palestine about the year 1728. On visiting Jerusalem he was struck with the apparent impossibility of reconciling the site of the present Church of the Holy Sepulchre with the exigencies of the Bible narrative, and on his return home published a work denying the authenticity of the so-called sacred locality. His heresies excited very little attention at the time, or for long afterward; but the spirit of inquiry which has sprung up during the present century has revived the controversy which has so long been dormant, and many pious and earnest men, both Protestant and Catholic, have expressed with more or less distinctness the difficulties they feel in reconciling the assumed locality with the indications in the Bible. The arguments in favor of the present locality being the correct one, are well summed up by the Rev. George

Williams in his work on the Holy City, and with the assistance of Professor Willis all has been said that can be urged in favor of its authenticity.

2. Professor Robinson, on the other hand, in his elaborate works on Palestine, has brought together all the arguments which from the time of Korte have been accumulating against the authenticity of the sites. He comes to the conclusion that the site of the Holy Sepulchre is now, and must in all probability forever remain, a mystery.

3. The third theory is that put forward by Mr. Fergusson. It agrees generally with the views urged by all those, from Korte to Robinson, who doubt the authenticity of the present site of the sepulchre; but instead of acquiescing in the desponding view taken by the latter, it goes on to assert that the building now known to Christians as the Mosque of Omar, but by Moslems called the Dome of the Rock, is the identical church which Constantine erected over the rock which contained the tomb of Christ.



Mount of Olives.

CHAPTER XII.

THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION OF CHRIST. FROM EASTER DAY TO ASCENSION DAY, APRIL 8TH TO MAY 17TH, A.D. 30.

- § 1. *First Day of the next week*: the 17th of Nisan, Sunday, April 8th, **EASTER DAY**—Difficulties in the Harmony—(i.) The **RESURRECTION OF CHRIST**—Its time—The “three days” in the tomb—(ii.) Visit of the women to the Sepulchre, which they find empty—(iii.) Mary Magdalene carries the news to Peter and John—(iv.) Vision of an angel to the women—(v.) *First Appearance of Jesus*, to the women on their return—(vi.) Peter and John go to the Sepulchre—Order of the grave-clothes—(vii.) *Second Appearance of Jesus*, to Mary Magdalene at the Sepulchre—(viii.) *Third Appearance of Jesus*, to Peter—(ix.) His *Fourth appearance*, on the journey to Emmaus—(x.) His *Fifth Appearance*, to the assembled Apostles, except Thomas—Their commission and inspiration. § 2. Sunday, the 24th of Nisan, April 15th—(xi.) *Christ’s Sixth Appearance*, to all the Apostles—Confession of Thomas. § 3. The disciples depart into Galilee—(xii.) *Christ’s Seventh Appearance*, to the Apostles at the Lake of Galilee—Peter’s avowal of his love: his new commission given, and his death foretold—(xiii.) *Christ’s Eighth Appearance*, to the great body of his disciples on the Galilean Mount—His great commission, and promise of the Holy Spirit—(xiv.) *Christ’s Ninth Appearance*, to James. § 4. (xv.) *Holy Thursday*, the 8d of Sivan, May 17th—His *Tenth and Last Appearance*, to the Apostles at Jerusalem—Promise of the Holy Spirit—He leads them out to

Bethany, and ASCENDS TO HEAVEN—The angels promise His second coming—The Apostles return to Jerusalem. § 5. St. John's conclusion of the Gospel narrative.

§ 1. *Sunday the 17th of Nisan (April 8th). The First Lord's day. "EASTER DAY."*

"Oh! day of days! shall hearts set free
No minstrel rapture find for thee?
Thou art the Sun of other days—
They shine by giving back thy rays."

As the resurrection of Christ is the great fact, so the day of its occurrence is the great day of Christianity. From the time of the Apostles its weekly return has been called by the name of the LORD'S DAY;¹ and to this epoch of the new creation of all things, marked by the new life of Christ, all the permanent sancity of the primeval Sabbath was transferred.²

Great difficulties have been found in making out the history of the day from the four Gospels;³ but these difficulties will yield to a careful study, based on the principle that each Evangelist wrote with a special purpose, and from special sources of information. It does not belong to our work to attempt a critical discussion of their several statements;⁴ but to give the result of such discussion in the most probable order of those appearances of Jesus to his disciples, which satisfied them that "the LORD was risen indeed."

i. The *Resurrection itself* is related only by St. Matthew:—"Behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men."⁵ That this account was derived, in part at least, from one or more of the Roman soldiers, professing afterward that belief which such a scene ought to have compelled, is probable from the acquaintance which the same Evangelist shows with the fact that they were at first bribed to give out the absurd story, that Roman soldiers had slept on duty, and *while asleep* had some-

¹ *Christian Year: Easter Day.*

² Rev. i. 20.

³ This is not the place to vindicate the doctrine of the Lord's Day. The sacred observance of the *first day of the week* is seen in such passages as John xx. 26, Acts xx. 7, 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

⁴ To which must be added the statement of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 4-7.

⁵ The argument is fully stated by Dr. Robinson, in his *Harmony*, and in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1845, pp. 162, foll.

⁶ Matt. xxviii. 2-4.

how come to know that the body was stolen by the disciples.⁷ But yet it may be doubted whether this is not one of the cases, in which the sacred writers were taught, as Paul declares himself to have been taught this very fact, "not of man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."⁸

The *time* of the resurrection is stated by St. Mark as "*early on the first day of the week,*"⁹ which began from the sunset of the evening before. It had already taken place when the first visit was paid to the sepulchre, "*while it was yet dark,*"¹⁰ as it began to dawn."¹¹ The portion, however brief, of this day (according to Jewish reckoning) that Jesus remained in the tomb is reckoned as one day, like the brief interval between his burial and the Friday's sunset, and thus he remained *three days* in the earth.¹²

ii. *Visit of the Women to the Sepulchre.* The Jewish custom of resuming the occupations of common life the moment the Sabbath's sun had set, had enabled the two Marys to purchase on that evening the spices needed to complete the embalmment which Nicodemus had hastily performed. At the approach of dawn they came to the sepulchre, with certain other women, among whom was Joanna, to perform this pious service, wondering, as they went along, how they could roll away the great stone from its mouth. They reached the sepulchre at sunrise and found the stone removed; and entering they saw that the body of Jesus was gone.¹³

iii. *Mary Magdalene carries the news to Peter and John.* The ardent love of Mary Magdalene prompted her at once to run and tell Peter and John of the trick that she supposed had been played by the enemies of Christ in removing his body beyond the reach of his disciples.¹⁴

iv. *Vision of an Angel to the Women in the Sepulchre.* Meanwhile the other women had entered the recesses of the

⁷ Matt. xxviii. 11-15.

⁸ Gal. i. 12; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 3.

⁹ Mark xvi. 9.

¹⁰ John xx. 1.

¹¹ Matt. xxviii. 1.

¹² Matt. xii. 40, xvi. 21, xx. 19, xxvii. 63; Mark viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 34; Luke ix. 22, xviii. 33; John ii. 19, etc. The difficulty of the statement in Matt. xii. 40, that Jesus should be "*three days and three nights*" in the sepulchre—the only place in which that form of expression occurs—is explained from the fact that Christ is here quoting from

Jonah i. 17. "The phrase," says Dr. Robinson, "is doubtless equivalent to the Greek *νυχθημερον*, a day and night of twenty-four hours. But the Hebrew form, *three days and three nights*, was likewise used generally and indefinitely for *three days* simply; as is obvious from 1 Sam. xii. 13, and the circumstances there narrated."

¹³ Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1-4; Luke xxiv. 1-3, 10; John xx. 1, 2.

¹⁴ John xx. 2. Throughout the whole narrative, John speaks of the events witnessed by himself.

rock-hewn sepulchre, and there they saw an angel sitting on the right side, in the form of a young man in a long white robe, who told them that Christ had risen and would meet his disciples in Galilee, with other words of comfort and encouragement.¹⁵ Fear at the vision, and joy at the tidings, joined to hasten the flight of the women from the sepulchre, that they might carry the news to the disciples.

v. *First appearance of Jesus—to the Women on their return from the Sepulchre.* Their hasty course was stayed by the appearance and greeting of Jesus himself. They fell down to worship him, and received from his own lips the same message that the angel had given them.¹⁶ The Apostles and other disciples received the intelligence “as idle tales,” not being yet ready to believe the truth.¹⁷

vi. *Visit of Peter and John to the Sepulchre.* Luke speaks of the *Eleven* (a common formula for the body of the Apostles at this period) as receiving these tidings from the women, and that so as to imply that they had re-assembled from their flight, and were waiting to see what would happen on this day. But it is evident from John, that both Peter and John himself were away from the rest, probably at the latter’s house, where John would naturally remain to comfort his new-found mother, and where his friend, disgraced in the eyes of the other disciples, would find a refuge for his remorse.¹⁸ To them Mary had brought word that the sepulchre was empty; and, while the other women were giving their fuller tidings to the rest of the Apostles, Peter and John ran to the sepulchre to see for themselves. We trace something of the peculiar character of each in the beautifully simple narrative of John.¹⁹ The ardent affection of “the disciple whom Jesus loved” carried him first to the sepulchre: he looked in and saw the grave-clothes, but hesitated to enter: while Peter, coming up, at once went in and saw the linen clothes lying as they had been left, and the napkin that had been about the head of Jesus

¹⁵ Matt. xxviii. 5-8; Mark xvi. 5-8; Luke xxiv. 4-8. St. Luke, in speaking of *two angels*, evidently puts into one this and the subsequent vision of angels to Mary Magdalene, which is mentioned only by St. John.

¹⁶ Matt. *only*, xxviii. 9, 10. Mark and Luke both relate the return of the women, omitting the appearance of Christ. The former adds that he appeared *first* to Mary Magdalene. This is just what might be expected,

according to the view that Mark wrote what he learned chiefly from St. Peter; for it was Mary Magdalene that brought to Peter, with John, the first tidings of the resurrection.

¹⁷ Luke xxiv. 9-10.

¹⁸ So John says that, after their visit to the sepulchre, they returned “to their own *home*.” John xx. 10.

¹⁹ John xx. 3-10: comp. Luke xxiv. 12.

folded together by itself.²⁰ John then entered and saw the same spectacle; and while Peter only wondered,²¹ John believed; for, as he himself takes care to tell us, the disciples had not yet understood the prophecy of His resurrection.²²

“ *Reason and Faith at once set out
To search the Saviour's tomb:
Faith faster runs, but waits without,
As fearing to presume,
Till Reason enter in, and trace
Christ's relics round the holy place—
'Here lay his limbs, and here his sacred head,
And who was by, to make his new-forsaken bed?*”

“ Both wonder—one believes. But while
'They muse on all at home,
No thought can tender *Love*²³ beguile
From Jesus' grave to roam.
Weeping she stays till he appear—
Her witness first the Church must hear:
All joy to souls that can rejoice
With her at earliest call of his dear gracious voice.”

vii. *Second appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene at the Sepulchre.* While Peter and John returned home, Mary, who had followed them back to the sepulchre, stood by its entrance, as the words just quoted have described. Looking into the sepulchre as she wept, she saw two angels sitting, at the head and the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. To their inquiry why she wept, she answered, “Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him;” and she was turning away, to leave the sepulchre in despair, when she saw Jesus standing before her, though she knew him not, even when he asked her why she wept. Taking him for the keeper of the garden, she earnestly entreated him to tell her whither he had removed the body. The one word, “*Mary*,” from the lips of Jesus, recalled her to herself, and turning so as to have a full view of him for the first time, she replied, “*Rabboni!*” that is, “*Master!*” and would have embraced him. But, with the mysterious injunc-

²⁰ The minuteness of this record seems to be intended as a proof that the body could not have been stolen by the disciples; for they would have carried off the grave-clothes with it in their haste. In this remarkable phrase the Evangelist points, not to Christ's own sayings, but to some passage of the O. T.; and such we find in Ps. xvi. 10, as interpreted by Peter in Acts ii. 25-31.

²¹ Luke xxiv. 12.

²² “They knew not the *Scripture*.”

²³ Mary Magdalene.

²⁴ *Christian Year: St. Thomas's Day*

tion, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father," he sent her to forewarn his brethren of his ascension. But even at this second testimony the disciples remained incredulous.²⁵

viii. *Third appearance of Jesus—to St. Peter.* St. Paul states, immediately after the fact of our Lord's resurrection, "that he was seen of Cephas," before he appeared to the other Apostles.²⁶ This appearance is also mentioned incidentally, but very emphatically, by St. Luke, in connection with the journey to Emmaus.²⁷

ix. *The Journey to Emmaus—our Lord's fourth appearance.* This is briefly mentioned by St. Mark;²⁸ but the deeply interesting narrative of St. Luke²⁹ gives us a view of the disciples' state of mind on this memorable day. Two of them, Cleopas³⁰ and another, left the city after the visits paid to the sepulchre by the women and by Peter and John, and walked to Emmaus, a village about seven miles from Jerusalem.³¹ Their only object seems to have been, to talk freely with each other respecting the bearing of the recent events on the question of the Messiahship of Jesus;³² and the doubtful result of their discussions is expressed in the exclamation, "But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel!" As they were thus engaged, Jesus himself joined them; but a spell was upon their eyes,³³ so that they did not know him. Every reader of the Gospel is familiar with what followed,—the statement of their anxious reasonings; his rebuke of their ignorance and unbelief, and his exposition of the Scripture which foretold his sufferings and glory; their pressing him to stay with them at the village; and his being made known to them by blessing and breaking the bread at their evening meal. They hastened back to Jerusalem, and found the Apostles assembled with other disciples at their evening meal,³⁴ in a strangely mingled state of doubt and wonder; for, while some met them with the news, "The

²⁵ John xx. 11-18; Mark xvi. 9-11.

²⁶ 1 Cor. xv. 5. ²⁷ Luke xxiv. 34.

²⁸ Mark xvi. 12, 13.

²⁹ Luke xxiv. 13-35.

³⁰ This Cleopas must not be confounded with Clopas, the husband of Mary the sister of our Lord's mother.

³¹ "Sixty stadia," in what direction we are not told. The idea of its identity with the Emmaus (afterward called Nicopolis) on the border of the Philistine plain, and about 20 miles

from Jerusalem—held by Eusebius and Jerome, and defended by Dr. Robinson—is quite inconsistent with the sacred narrative. See *Dict. of the Bible*, art. EMMAUS.

³² The word συζητῶν, in ver. 15, implies anxious discussion.

³³ Literally "their eyes were mastered," ἐκπατοῦντο. Hence the phrase in Mark, "He appeared in another (i. e., an altered) form."

³⁴ Mark xvi. 14.

Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon," their own full account of his converse with them was still received with unbelief.

x. *Our Lord's fifth appearance—to the assembled Apostles, except Thomas.* It was at this very crisis of their perplexity, that Jesus crowned his separate appearances by a manifestation of himself to the Apostles, and those disciples who were with them. His sudden appearance in their midst, the doors of the room being shut fast for fear of the Jews, alarmed them with the idea that they saw a spirit, though he greeted them with the words, "Peace be unto you!" But he called them to feel his body, and showed them the wounds in his hands and feet and side. As they still doubted, he ate food before them; and then he opened their minds to see the fulfillment of all that had been spoken of him in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; and to know their own mission as the witnesses of his resurrection, and the preachers of repentance and remission of sins in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Then by the sign of breathing on them (literally suspiration), he indicated the conferring of that gift of the Holy Spirit, which was actually to descend upon them after his ascension, and for which he bade them to wait at Jerusalem; and he gave them the authority of remitting and retaining sins.³⁵ This "great commission" was repeated afterward; but Mark, who mentions only three of our Lord's appearances, and this as the last, refers to this occasion also the promise of the power of working miracles.³⁶ Such was our Lord's last appearance to his disciples on the day of his resurrection.

§ 2. *Sunday, the 24th of Nisan, April 16th.*—

(xi.) *Christ's second appearance to the assembled disciples, with Thomas—the sixth in all.* Facts are sometimes of themselves strong arguments; and such is our finding the disciples again assembled on the *first day* of the following week, and our Lord again appearing in the midst of them. Their mere meeting may have been continued from day to day, but our Saviour's blessing this meeting with his presense goes far to mark the Lord's Day as sacred. It was then that the incredulous Thomas was taught by the evidence of his own senses, not only to share his brethren's faith, but to go beyond them

³⁵ The nature of this authority is seen in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, Simon Magus, and perhaps Elymas the sorcerer.

³⁶ Mark xvi. 14-18; Luke xxiv. 36-49; John xx. 19-23; 1 Cor. xv. 5, "then of the twelve." St. Matt. does not mention this appearance.

by recognizing in the Lord's resurrection a proof of his divinity. But Jesus did not grant the proof that Thomas required, without pronouncing a higher blessing upon those who are content to believe on the testimony of others.³⁷

§ 3. (xii.) *Third appearance of Jesus to the Apostles (seven of them) by the Lake of Galilee*—the seventh in all. The Evangelists now cease to specify days. St. Matthew tells us that the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, as they had been commanded when first the resurrection was announced to them;³⁸ but their meeting with Jesus in the mountain he had appointed them must have been subsequent to that morning by the Lake of Galilee, of which St. John has given us so full and touching an account.³⁹ Seven of the apostles—Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee, and two others who are not named, had returned to their avocations as fishermen, when Jesus revealed himself to them in a manner strikingly similar to that of their former calling, by the sign of a miraculous draught of fishes. The one striking difference, that now the net did *not* break, showed the coming of the time when they were to be indeed “fishers of men.” It was then that our Lord drew from Peter the avowal of his love, repeated thrice as the revocation of his threefold denial, and restored him to his place among the disciples by the special commission, also thrice repeated, “Feed my sheep!” adding the prediction of his martyrdom, but rebuking his affectionate curiosity concerning the fate of John. The saying, “*If I will* that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?” is a purely hypothetical case, put to repel a curious desire to know what he reserved to his own appointment.

xiii. *The eighth appearance of Jesus—to the great body of his disciples in Galilee.* St. Matthew continues the statement just quoted by saying that the eleven disciples went out to a mountain in Galilee, where Jesus had appointed them; and when they saw him they worshiped him, but some doubted.⁴⁰ Though Matthew mentions only the eleven, he can scarcely mean the last statement to apply to *them*, after the removal of the last remains of their incredulity in the case of Thomas. It is evident, from comparing the Gospels, that, in several statements which refer to the body of the disciples, the eleven are particularly named, because they were specially the appointed witnesses of Christ's resurrection. All that we see of their life during this interval confirms the view that the

³⁷ John xx. 24-29.

³⁸ Matt. xxviii. 16.

³⁹ John xxi. 1-24.

⁴⁰ Matt. xxviii. 16, 17.

Apostles were in no way separated from the other disciples. At the beginning of the last chapter of Matthew, the message, first of the angel and then of Christ himself, is to "the disciples" and "his brethren," not to the Apostles only; and the Evangelist clearly records this meeting in Galilee as the fulfillment of that message. There is, therefore, no difficulty in identifying this interview with the appearance of Jesus to "above five hundred brethren at once," mentioned by St. Paul, who appeals to the fact that some of them were still living when he wrote.⁴¹ This number agrees well with that assigned by St. Luke to the Church at Jerusalem;⁴² for as these were one hundred and twenty, and as the greater number of our Lord's converts were made in Galilee, five hundred and upward is a reasonable number for those of Galilee, with the Apostles, and such others as were able to accompany them from Judæa.

This then was the great interview of Jesus with his disciples, of which he had spoken even before his death,⁴³ and to which they were summoned from the moment of his resurrection. Its scene was *Galilee*, where Jesus had commenced his course of public teaching and where his life had been chiefly spent; and as he had opened his public ministry on a mountain, by the discourse which set forth the conditions of discipleship, so he closed it on a mountain, by the commission which he based upon his own unlimited authority, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always unto the end of the world."⁴⁴ It follows from the above argument that this commission was given to the *disciples*, as such, and not to the Apostles only; and this is true also of the promise of miraculous powers, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, which are recorded respectively by Mark and John.

xiv. *Christ's ninth appearance—to James (the Less)*. Immediately after mentioning this interview, St. Paul adds the words "after that, he was seen of James," a special notice, which agrees well with the importance assigned to James, as being, like Peter and John, one of the "pillars" of the Church.⁴⁵ This appearance may be referred to Jerusalem, with the more probability, as James was not one among the Apostles at the Lake of Galilee. Nor does it seem unlikely that

⁴¹ 1 Cor. xv. 6.⁴² Matt. xxvi. 32.⁴³ Acts i. 15.⁴⁴ Matt. xxviii. 18-20.⁴⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 7; Gal. ii. 9.

it was one of several appearances to individual disciples, omitted by the Evangelists, who have recorded only those needful to establish the great facts of Christ's resurrection, and of his commission to the Apostles.

§ 4. (xv.) *Our Lord's last interview with the Apostles and his Ascension—his tenth appearance.* The last scene of all was reserved for the eyes of the Apostles only, as the specially appointed witnesses of Christ's resurrection and ascension. St. Peter lays stress upon the fact that, when God had raised Jesus from the dead, "he shewed him, openly, *not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God*; even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead."⁴⁶ The superiority of such testimony to any which could have been furnished by a more public display of the risen Saviour to all the people has been ably demonstrated by Bishop Horsley.⁴⁷ Neither Matthew nor John relates our Saviour's ascension, though the latter gives, in the Apocalypse, a glowing description of his state of glory. Mark simply says that "he was received up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God."⁴⁸ St. Luke describes the whole scene, briefly in his Gospel, and fully in the Acts of the Apostles.⁴⁹

The whole time during which Jesus "shewed himself after his passion by many infallible proofs" was *forty days*,⁵⁰ a period which has evidently some mystical signification, being the same as the time spent by Moses and by Elijah in Mount Horeb, and by Christ himself in the wilderness of temptation, and corresponding to the number of years that the people had wandered in the Desert. As they passed an appointed interval of trial between their baptism to Moses in the Red Sea and their entrance on the promised land, so our Lord himself was subjected to a forty days' trial of his faith and patience, between his baptism and his showing to Israel; and again, after his final baptism of suffering a like interval was interposed before he entered into glory, to try the faith of his disciples and to work in them full conviction of the great truth they had to preach. In what secret retirement he took up his abode during these forty days we are not told: all that concerns us is the time he spent with his disciples, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."

At last, on the fortieth day,⁵¹ the disciples were assembled

⁴⁶ Acts x. 40, 41.

⁴⁷ *Sermons on the Resurrection of Christ.*

⁴⁸ Mark xvi. 19.

⁵⁰ Acts i. 3.

⁵¹ Thursday, the 25th of Jyar, "Holy Thursday," or "Ascension Day," May 18th, in A.D. 30

⁴⁹ Luke xxiv. 50-53; Acts i. 1-12.

with Jesus at Jerusalem, it would seem by a special appointment," and he commanded them not to depart thence till they received the promise of the Father, the baptism with the Holy Ghost. After rebuking their desire to know whether the time was come for him to restore the kingdom to Israel, he promised them power, by that baptism of the Spirit, for the work they had to do for his name in Jerusalem, Judæa, and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth."

Either during or after this conversation, he led them out—over the very ground he had traversed with them six weeks before, when he entered the city to suffer—as far as Bethany, on the further slope of the Mount of Olives, and so out of view of the city; ⁵² and there, as with uplifted hands he gave them his parting blessing, a cloud interposed between him and them, like the chariot and horses of fire that separated Elijah from Elisha; and upborne on this aerial car, he was wafted from their sight through the vault of heaven.⁵⁴ This was all they saw; but the inspired Psalmist had long before described the unseen glories of Christ's ascension:

"The chariots of God are twenty thousand,
Even thousands, even thousands of angels:
The Lord is among them
As in Sinai, in the holy place.
Thou hast ascended on high,
Thou hast led captivity captive:
Thou hast received gifts for men;
Yea, for the rebellious also, that
Jehovah God might dwell among them."⁵⁵

What those spiritual gifts were and how they were soon distributed to the Church is explained by the Apostle Paul."

Meanwhile the disciples scarcely recollected that this was but what he had himself foretold:—"What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?"⁵⁷ They stood gazing up after him as if he had been lost forever, till they were awakened from their stupor by the appearance of two angels standing by them, and declaring that this same Jesus, who was taken from them into heaven, should so come in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven:—words which exclude any other than the final advent of our Lord, and

⁵² Acts i. 4: comp. v. 6.

⁵³ Acts i. 4-8.

⁵⁴ On the site of our Lord's Ascension, see p. 339.

⁵⁵ This is manifestly all that is expressed by *the heaven* (οὐρανός) of

the narrative, which has the same sense in Gen. i. 1, and many other passages; the proper literal sense of the English word.

⁵⁶ Ps. lxxviii. 17, 18.

⁵⁷ Eph. iv. 8, 9.

⁵⁸ John vi. 62.

teach us that he shall then be seen descending from the riven sky as plainly and as unexpectedly as he passed into it from their eyes. With this agrees his own warning of "the sign of the Son of Man, coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory," and the words of the final Scripture prophecy, "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him."

Having worshiped their glorified Lord, they returned from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem with great joy; and, while expecting the promised gift of the Holy Spirit, they spent their time continually in the Temple, praising and blessing God.⁶⁰

§ 5. We can not more fitly conclude this narrative of our Saviour's life on earth,—in which we have aimed to bring into one view the records of the Four Evangelists, with as much brevity as was consistent with the omission of no important fact,—than by calling attention to the two points insisted on by St. John:—first, that we have only a small part of our Lord's sayings and doings in the presence of his disciples, for the world itself could hardly have contained the record of the whole; but, finally, that all we do possess has been written with this one sole object, "That we might *believe* that JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, and that, *believing*, we might have LIFE THROUGH HIS NAME."⁶¹

⁶⁰ Luke xxiv. 50-53; Acts i. 1-12.

⁶¹ John xx. 30, 31; xxi. 25.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

MR. LEWIN'S SCHEME OF THE CHRONOLOGY OF OUR LORD'S LIFE.

IN the elaborate work of Mr. Lewin, *Fasti Sacri, or a Key to the Chronology of the New Testament*, a chronological scheme is given, differing from the views of most previous writers, and from the system followed in our work. Without reopening the discussion, which would

far overpass our limits, the care bestowed upon every detail of the subject by so eminent a writer demands a brief statement of the results at which he has arrived.

B.C. 6 (about Feb. 22). Birth of John the Baptist; the time of Elisabeth's conception being inferred from the calculation that the course of Abia went out of office on May 22, B.C. 7.

B.C. 6 (about August 1). THE NATIVITY OF JESUS CHRIST; nearly two years before the death of Herod (Matt. ii. 16).

The Census under Sentius Saturninus, who displaced Varus before September 2. B.C. 6.

B.C. 4. April 1. Death of Herod at Jericho.

Return of the Holy Family from Egypt.

A.D. 6. Banishment of Archelaus. Cyrenius prefect of Syria.

A.D. 7. Completion of the Census of Cyrenius.

CHRIST AT THE PASSOVER (April 9th).

A.D. 28 (about Aug. or Sept.). *Preaching of John the Baptist*, in the first year of the Sabbatic cycle, in the six'h year of which our Lord's Ministry closed.

A.D. 29 (February). Baptism of Jesus. Age 33.*

(February to March). The Temptation.

A.D. 29—A.D. 33. *The Duration of Christ's Ministry*, from Passover to Passover, four full years, in accordance with Luke xiii. 7.

A.D. 29. FIRST PASSOVER, ending April 2. Opening of our Lord's Ministry at Jerusalem.

Imprisonment of John.

A.D. 29 (Autumn). Beginning of Christ's Ministry in Galilee. Its duration—3 years and 6 months.

First Circuit in Galilee, including (about October) his rejection at Nazareth.†

A.D. 29 to A.D. 30 (Spring). *Second Galilean Circuit*: duration—four or five months.

A.D. 30 (Spring). *Third Galilean Circuit*.

April 22. The δευτεροπρωτον σαββατον, i. e., the first Sabbath of the 2d month (Iyar).

May 27. *The Pentecost*, this year on a Sabbath. The "Feast" of John v.

Jesus returns to Galilee.

Sermon on the Mount.

* Mr Lewin gives this latitude to the about thirty (δωδεκα) of Luke iii. 23.

† Mr. Lewin's authority for this date is in the fact that Isaiah lxi. was the appointed lesson of the daily service about the *Feast of Tabernacles*, which in this year fell on October 11.

Fourth Galilean Circuit.

(Autumn). Return to Capernaum.

A.D. 31 (about April). Death of John the Baptist.

April 19 (10 of Nisan). Feeding of the Five Thousand.

April 21. The Discourse of John vi.: on the Sabbath before the Passover.

Sept. 20. Feast of Tabernacles (John vii. 1).

Sept. 28 (about). Jesus reaches Jerusalem.

He withdraws, probably to Bethabara.

Nov. 28 to Dec. 5. Feast of Dedication (John x).

Jesus returned to Bethabara (John x. 31).

A.D. 32 (Beginning). Death and raising of Lazarus.

Jesus retires to Ephraim, and thence to Caesarea Philippi.

Return to Capernaum. Tribute Money.

Passover, April 13. Beginning of our Lord's last circuit, occupying a year, and terminating at Jerusalem.

(Autumn.) The warning to flee out of Galilee.

A.D. 33. (Spring.) The circuit resumed from West to East, along the borders of Samaria and Galilee, in the direction of Persees, and so across the Jordan.

Recrosses the Jordan to Jericho.

Friday, March 27. Arrives at Bethany, six days before the Passover.

Saturday, March 28. Rest at Bethany on the Sabbath evening. Supper at the house of Simon.

Palm Sunday, March 29. Jesus enters Jerusalem.

Monday, March 30—Thursday, April 2. As in our narrative.

Thursday, April 2—Evening. The Passover and Lord's Supper.

Good Friday, April 3. The Crucifixion. Jesus expires at 3 P.M.

Easter Sunday, April 5. The Resurrection.

Thursday, May 14. The Ascension.

Sunday, May 24. Day of Pentecost.

APPENDIX TO BOOK II

THE FOUR GOSPELS.¹

§ 1. Their genuineness. § 2. Their relation to each other. § 3. Theories of their origin.
§ 4. Probability that they were based on Apostolic preaching. § 5. Inspiration of the Evangelists. § 6. Table of the Harmony of the Four Gospels.

§ 1. THE name Gospel² is applied to the four inspired histories of the life and teaching of Christ contained in the New Testament. It may be fairly said that the genuineness of these four narratives rests upon better evidence than that of any other ancient writings. They were all composed during the latter half of the first century: those of St. Matthew and St. Mark some years before the destruction of Jerusalem; that of St. Luke probably about A.D. 64; and that of St. John toward the close of the century. Before the end of the second century, there is abundant evidence that the Four Gospels, as one collection, were generally used and accepted.

§ 2. On comparing these four books one with another, a peculiar difficulty claims attention, which has had much to do with the controversy as to their genuineness. In the fourth Gospel the narrative coincides with that of the other three in a few passages only. Putting aside the account of the Passion, there are only three facts which John relates in common with the other Evangelists. Two of these are, the feeding of the five thousand, and the storm on the Sea of Galilee (ch. vi.), which appear to be introduced in connection with the discourse that arose out of the miracle, related by John alone. The third is the anointing of His feet by Mary; and it is worthy of notice that the narrative of John recalls something of each of the other three: the actions of the woman are drawn from Luke, the ointment and its value are described in Mark, and the admonition to Judas appears in Matthew; and John combines in his narrative all these particulars. While the three present the life of Jesus in Galilee, John follows him into Judæa; nor should we know, but for him, that our Lord had journeyed to Jerusalem at the prescribed feasts. Only one discourse of our Lord that was delivered in Galilee, that in the 6th chapter, is recorded by John. The disciple whom Jesus loved had it put into his mind to write a Gospel which should more expressly than the others set forth Jesus as the Incarnate Word of God: if he also had in view the beginnings of the errors of Cerinthus and others before him at the time, as Irenæus and Jerome assert, the polemical purpose is quite subordinate to the dogmatic.

¹ The following account of the Four Gospels is taken, with some omissions, from Archbishop Thompson's article in the *Dial.* of the Bible.

² From *god* and *spell*, Ang-Sax. *good message* or *news*, which is a translation of the Greek *εὐαγγέλιον*.

He does not war against a temporary error, but preaches for all time that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, in order that believing we may have life through his name. Now many of the facts omitted by St. John and recorded by the rest are such as would have contributed most directly to this great design; why then are they omitted? The received explanation is the only satisfactory one, namely, that John, writing last, at the close of the first century, had seen the other Gospels, and purposely abstained from writing anew what they had sufficiently recorded.

In the other three Gospels there is a great amount of agreement. If we suppose the history that they contain to be divided into sections, in 42 of these all the three narratives coincide, 12 more are given by Matthew and Mark only, 5 by Mark and Luke only, and 14 by Matthew and Luke. To these must be added 5 peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark, and 9 to Luke; and the enumeration is complete. But this applies only to general coincidence as to the facts narrated: the amount of verbal coincidence, that is, the passages either verbally the same, or coinciding in the use of many of the same words, is much smaller. "By far the larger portion," says Professor Andrews Norton (*Genuineness*, i. p. 240, 2d ed.), "of this verbal agreement is found in the recital of the words of others, and particularly of the words of Jesus. Thus, in Matthew's Gospel, the passages verbally coincident with one or both of the other two Gospels amount to less than a sixth part of its contents; and of these about seven-eighths occur in the recital of the words of others, and only about one-eighth in what, by way of distinction, I may call mere narrative, in which the Evangelist, speaking in his own person, was unrestrained in the choice of his expressions. In Mark, the proportion of coincident passages to the whole contents of the Gospel is about one-sixth, of which not one-fifth occurs in the narrative. Luke has still less agreement of expression with the other Evangelists. The passages in which it is found amount only to about a tenth part of his Gospel; and but an inconsiderable portion of it appears in the narrative—less than a twentieth part. These proportions should be further compared with those which the narrative part of each Gospel bears to that in which the words of others are professedly repeated. Matthew's narrative occupies about one-fourth of his Gospel, Mark's about one-half, and Luke's about one-third. It may easily be computed, therefore, that the proportion of verbal coincidence found in the narrative part of each Gospel, compared with what exists in the other part, is about in the following ratios: in Matthew as one to somewhat more than two, in Mark as one to four, and in Luke as one to ten."

Without going minutely into the examination of examples, which would be desirable if space permitted, the leading facts connected with the subject may be thus summed up:—The verbal and material agreement of the three first Evangelists is such as does not occur in any other authors who have written independently of one another. The verbal agreement is greater where the spoken words of others are cited than where facts are recorded; and greatest in quotations of the words of our Lord. But in some leading events, as in the call of the four first disciples, that of Matthew, and the Transfiguration, the agreement even in expression is remarkable: there are also narratives where there is no verbal harmony in the outset, but only in the crisis or emphatic part of the story (Matt. viii. 3=Mark i. 41=Luke v. 13, and Matt. xiv. 19, 20=Mark vi. 41-43=Luke ix. 16, 17).

The narratives of our Lord's early life, as given by St. Matthew and St. Luke, have little in common; while St. Mark does not include that part of the history in his plan. The agreement in the narrative portions of the Gospels begins with the Baptism of John, and reaches its highest point in the account of the Passion of our Lord and the facts that preceded it; so that a direct ratio might almost be said to exist between the amount of agreement and the nearness of the facts related to the Passion. After this event, in the account of his burial and resurrection, the coincidences are few. The language of all three is Greek, with Hebrew idioms: the Hebraisms are most abundant in St. Mark, and fewest in St. Luke. In quotations from the Old Testament, the Evangelists, or two of them, sometimes exhibit a verbal agreement, although they differ from the Hebrew and from the Septuagint version (Matt. iii. 3=Mark. i. 3=Luke iii. 4. Matt. iv. 10=Luke iv. 8. Matt. xi. 10=Mark i. 2=Luke vii. 27, etc). Except as to 24 verses, the Gospel of Mark contains no principal facts which are not found in Matthew and Luke, but he often supplies details omitted by them, and these are often such as would belong to the graphic account of an eye-witness. There are no cases in which Matthew and Luke exactly harmonize where Mark does not also coincide with them. In several places the words of Mark have something in common with each of the other narratives, so as to form a connecting link between them, where their words slightly differ. The examples of verbal agreement between Mark and Luke are not so long or so numerous as those between Matthew and Luke, and Matthew and Mark; but as to the arrangement of events Mark and Luke frequently coincide, where Matthew differs from them. These are the leading particulars; but they are very far from giving a complete notion of a phenomenon that is well worthy of that attention and reverent study of the sacred text by which alone it can be fully and fairly apprehended.

These facts exhibit the three Gospels as three distinct records of the life and works of the Redeemer, but with a greater amount of agreement than three wholly independent accounts could be expected to exhibit. The agreement would be no difficulty, without the differences; it would only mark the one divine source from which they are all derived—the Holy Spirit, who spake by the prophets. The difference of form and style, without the agreement, would offer no difficulty, since there may be a substantial harmony between accounts that differ greatly in mode of expression, and the very difference might be a guarantee of independence. The harmony and the variety, the agreement and the differences, form together the problem with which Biblical critics have occupied themselves for a century and a half.

§ 8. The attempts at a solution are so many, that they can be more easily classified than enumerated. The first and most obvious suggestion would be that the narrators made use of each other's work. Accordingly many have endeavored to ascertain which Gospel is to be regarded as the first; which is copied from the first; and which is the last, and copied from the other two. It is remarkable that each of the six possible combinations has found advocates; and this of itself proves the uncertainty of the theory. When we are told by men of research that the Gospel of St. Mark is plainly founded upon the other two, and again that the Gospel of St. Mark is certainly the primitive Gospel, on which the other two are founded, both

sides relying mainly on facts that lie within the compass of the text, we are not disposed to expect much fruit from the discussion. But the theory in its crude form is in itself most improbable; and the wonder is that so much time and learning have been devoted to it. It assumes that an Evangelist has taken up the work of his predecessor, and without substantial alteration has made a few changes in form, a few additions and retrenchments, and has then allowed the whole to go forth under his name. Whatever order of the three is adopted to favor the hypothesis, the omission by the second or third of matter inserted by the first, offers a great difficulty; since it would indicate a tacit opinion that these passages are either less useful or of less authority than the rest. The nature of the alterations is not such as we should expect to find in an age little given to literary composition, and in writings so simple and unlearned as these are admitted to be. The replacement of a word by a synonym neither more nor less apt, the omission of a saying in one place and insertion of it in another, the occasional transposition of events; these are not in conformity with the habits of a time in which composition was little studied, and only practiced as a necessity. Besides, such deviations, which in writers wholly independent of each other are only the guarantee of their independence, can not appear in those who copy from each other, without showing a certain willfulness—an intention to contradict and alter—that seems quite irreconcilable with any view of inspiration. These general objections will be found to take a still more cogent shape against any particular form of this hypothesis: whether it is attempted to show that the Gospel of St. Mark, as the shortest, is also the earliest and primitive Gospel, or that this very Gospel bears evident signs of being the latest, a compilation from the other two; or that the order in the canon of Scripture is also the chronological order—and all these views have found defenders at no distant date—the theory that each Evangelist only copied from his predecessor offers the same general features, a plausible argument from a few facts, which is met by insuperable difficulties as soon as the remaining facts are taken in.

The supposition of a common original, from which the three Gospels were drawn, each with more or less modification, would naturally occur to those who rejected the notion that the Evangelists had copied from each other. A passage of Epiphanius has been often quoted in support of this (*Hæres.* 51, 6), but the *ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πηγῆς* no doubt refers to the inspiring Spirit from which all three drew their authority, and not to any earthly copy, written or oral, of His divine message. The best notion of that class of speculations which would establish a *written document* as the common original of the three Gospels, will be gained perhaps from Bishop Marsh's account of Eichhorn's hypothesis, and of his own additions to it (*Michaelis*, vol. iii., Part ii.). It appeared to Eichhorn that the portions which are common to all the three Gospels were contained in a certain common document, from which they all drew. Now Eichhorn tries to show, from an exact comparison of passages, that "the sections, whether great or small, which are common to St. Matthew and St. Mark but not to St. Luke, and at the same time occupy places in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark which correspond to each other, were additions made in the copies used by St. Matthew and St. Mark, but not in the copy used by St. Luke; and, in like manner, that the sections found in the corresponding places of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, but not contained in the Gospel of St. Mat-

thew, were additions made in the copies used by St. Mark and St. Luke" (p. 192). Thus Eichhorn considers himself entitled to assume that he can reconstruct the original document, and also that there must have been four other documents to account for the phenomena of the text. Thus he makes—

1. The original document.
2. An altered copy which St. Matthew used.
3. An altered copy which St. Luke used.
4. A third copy, made from the two preceding, used by St. Mark.
5. A fourth altered copy, used by St. Matthew and St. Luke in common.

As there is no *external* evidence, worth considering, that this original or any of its numerous copies ever existed, the value of this elaborate hypothesis must depend upon its furnishing the only explanation, and that a sufficient one, of the facts of the text. Bishop Marsh, however, finds it necessary, in order to complete the account of the text, to raise the number of documents to eight, still without producing any external evidence for the existence of any of them; and this, on one side, deprives Eichhorn's theory of the merit of completeness, and, on the other, presents a much broader surface to the obvious objections. He assumes the existence of—

1. A Hebrew original.
2. A Greek translation.
3. A transcript of No. 1, with alterations and additions.
4. Another, with another set of alterations and additions.
5. Another, combining both the preceding, used by St. Mark, who also used No. 2.
6. Another, with the alterations and additions of No. 3, and with further additions, used by St. Matthew.
7. Another, with those of No. 4, and further additions, used by St. Luke, who also used No. 2.
8. A wholly distinct Hebrew document, in which our Lord's precepts, parables, and discourses were recorded, but not in chronological order; used both by St. Matthew and St. Luke.

To this it is added, that "as the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke contain Greek translations of Hebrew materials, which were incorporated into St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, the person who translated St. Matthew's Hebrew Gospel into Greek frequently derived assistance from the Gospel of St. Mark, where he had matter in connection with St. Matthew: and in those places, but in those places only, where St. Mark had no matter in connection with St. Matthew, he had frequently recourse to St. Luke's Gospel" (p. 361). One is hardly surprised after this to learn that Eichhorn soon after put forth a revised hypothesis (*Einleitung in das N. T.*, 1804), in which a supposed Greek translation of a supposed Aramaic original took a conspicuous part; nor that Hug was able to point out that even the most liberal assumption of written documents had not provided for one case, that of the verbal agreement of St. Mark and St. Luke, to the exclusion of St. Matthew; and which, though it is of rare occurrence, would still require, on Eichhorn's theory, an additional Greek version.

It will be allowed that this elaborate hypothesis, whether in the form given it by Marsh or by Eichhorn, possesses almost every fault that can be charged against an argument of that kind. For every new class of facts, a new document must be assumed to have existed; and Hug's objection—

does not really weaken the theory, since the new class of coincidences he mentions only requires a new version of the "original Gospel," which can be supplied on demand. A theory so prolific in assumptions may still stand, if it can be proved that no other solution is possible; but since this can not be shown, then we are reminded of the schoolman's caution, *Entia non sunt multiplicanda præter necessitatem*. To assume for every new class of facts the existence of another complete edition and recension of the original work, is quite gratuitous; the documents might have been as easily supposed to be fragmentary memorials, wrought in by the Evangelists into the web of the original Gospel; or the coincidences might be, as Gratz supposes, cases where one Gospel has been interpolated by portions of another. Then the "original Gospel" is supposed to have been of such authority as to be circulated everywhere: yet so defective, as to require annotation from any hand; so little revered, that no hand spared it. If all the Evangelists agreed to draw from such a work, it must have been widely, if not universally, accepted in the Church; and yet the work has perished without record. Not only has this fate befallen the Aramaic or Hebrew original, but the translation and the five or six recensions. But it may well be asked whether the state of letters in Palestine at this time was such as to make this constant editing, translating, annotating, and enriching of a history a natural and probable process. With the independence of the Jews their literature had declined; from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, if a writer here and there arose, his works became known, if at all, in Greek translations through the Alexandrine Jews. That the period of which we are speaking was for the Jews one of very little literary activity, is generally admitted; and if this applies to all classes of the people, it would be true of the humble and uneducated class from which the first converts came (Acts iv. 13; James ii. 5). Even the second law, which grew up after the Captivity, and in which the knowledge of the learned class consisted, was handed down by oral tradition, without being reduced to writing. The theory of Eichhorn is only probable amid a people given to literary habits, and in a class of that people in which education was good and literary activity likely to prevail: the conditions here are the very reverse. These are only a few of the objections which may be raised, on critical and historical grounds, against the theory of Eichhorn and Marsh.

But it must not be forgotten that this question reaches beyond history and criticism, and has a deep theological interest. We are offered here an original Gospel composed by some unknown person; probably not an apostle, as Eichhorn admits, in his endeavor to account for the loss of the book. This was translated by one equally unknown; and the various persons into whose hands the two documents came, all equally unknown, exercised freely the power of altering and extending the materials thus provided. Out of such unattested materials the three Evangelists composed their Gospels. So far as they allowed their materials to bind and guide them, so far their worth as independent witnesses is lessened. But, according to Eichhorn, they all felt bound to admit *the whole* of the original document, so that it is possible to recover it from them by a simple process. As to all the passages, then, in which this document is employed, it is not the Evangelist, but an anonymous predecessor, to whom we are listening—not Matthew the Apostle, and Mark the companion of Apostles, and Luke the beloved of the Apostle Paul, who are affording us the strength of their testimony, but one wit-

ness, whose name no one has thought fit to record. If, indeed, all three Evangelists confined themselves to this document, this of itself would be a guarantee of its fidelity and of the respect in which it was held; but no one seems to have taken it in hand that did not think himself entitled to amend it. Surely serious people would have a right to ask, if the critical objections were less decisive, with what view of inspiration such a hypothesis could be reconciled. The internal evidence of the truth of the Gospel, in the harmonious and self-consistent representation of the person of Jesus, and in the promises and precepts which meet the innermost needs of a heart stricken with the consciousness of sin, would still remain to us. But the wholesome confidence with which we now rely on the Gospels as pure, true, and genuine histories of the life of Jesus, composed by four independent witnesses inspired for that work, would be taken away. Even the testimony of the writers of the second century to the universal acceptance of these books would be invalidated, from their silence and ignorance about the strange circumstances which are supposed to have affected their composition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—The English student will find in Bp. Marsh's *Translation of Michaelis's Introd. to the N. T.* iii. 2, 1803, an account of Eichhorn's earlier theory and of his own. Voysie's *Examination of Mr. Marsh's Hypothesis*, 1808, has suggested many of the objections. In Bp. Thirlwall's *Translation of Schleiermacher on St. Luke*, 1825, Introduction, is an account of the whole question. Other principal works are, Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das N. T.* 1804; Gratz, *Neuer Versuch die Entstehung der drey ersten Evang. zu erklären*, 1862; Bertholdt, *Histor.-kritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanon. und apok. Schriften des A. und N. T.*, 1812-1819; Gieseler, *Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung, etc., der schriftlichen Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1818; De Wette, *Lehrbuch*; Weisse, *Evangelienfrage*, 1856; and Westcott, *History of N. T. Canon*, London, 1859.

§ 4. There is another supposition, to account for these facts, of which perhaps Gieseler has been the most acute expositor. It is probable that none of the Gospels were written until many years after the day of Pentecost, on which the Holy Spirit descended on the assembled disciples. From that day commenced at Jerusalem the work of preaching the Gospel and converting the world. So sedulous were the Apostles in this work that they divested themselves of the labor of ministering to the poor, in order that they might give themselves "continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word" (Acts vi.). Prayer and preaching were the business of their lives. Now their preaching must have been, from the nature of the case, in great part historical; it must have been based upon the account of the life and acts of Jesus of Nazareth. They had been the eye-witnesses of a wondrous life, of acts and sufferings that had an influence over all the world: many of their hearers had never heard of Jesus, many others had received false accounts of one whom it suited the Jewish rulers to stigmatize as an impostor. The ministry of our Lord went on principally in Galilee; the first preaching was addressed to people in Judæa. There was no written record to which the hearers might be referred for historical details, and therefore the preachers must furnish not only inferences from the life of our Lord, but the facts of the life itself. The preaching, then, must have been of such a kind as to be to the hearers what the reading of lessons from the Gospel is to us. So far as the records of apostolic preaching in the Acts of the Apostles go, they confirm this view. Peter at Cæsarea, and Paul at Antioch, preach alike the

facts of the Redeemer's life and death. There is no improbability in supposing that in the course of twenty or thirty years' assiduous teaching without a written Gospel, the matter of the apostolic preaching should have taken a settled form. Not only might the Apostles think it well that their own accounts should agree, as in substance so in form; but the teachers whom they sent forth, or left behind in the churches they visited, would have to be prepared for their mission; and, so long as there was no written Gospel to put into their hands, it might be desirable that the oral instruction should be as far as possible one and the same to all. It is by no means certain that the interval between the mission of the Comforter and his work of directing the writing of the first Gospel was so long as is here supposed; the date of the Hebrew St. Matthew may be earlier. But the argument remains the same: the preaching of the Apostles would probably begin to take one settled form, if at all, during the first years of their ministry. If it were allowed us to ask why God in his providence saw fit to defer the gift of a written Gospel to his people, the answer would be, that for the first few years the powerful working of the Holy Spirit in the living members of the Church supplied the place of those records which, as soon as the brightness of his presence began to be all withdrawn, became indispensable in order to prevent the corruption of the Gospel history by false teachers. He was promised as one who should "teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever" the Lord had "said unto them" (John xiv. 26). And more than once his aid is spoken of as needful, even for the proclamation of the facts that relate to Christ (Acts i. 8; 1 Pet. i. 12); and he is described as a witness *with* the Apostles, rather than through them, of the things which they had seen during the course of a ministry which they had shared (John xv. 26, 27; Acts v. 32: compare Acts xv. 28). The personal authority of the Apostles as eye-witnesses of what they preached is not set aside by this divine aid: again and again they describe themselves as "witnesses" to facts (Acts ii. 32, iii. 15, x. 39, etc.); and when a vacancy occurs in their number through the fall of Judas, it is almost assumed as a thing of course that his successor shall be chosen from those "which had companied with them all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them" (Acts i. 21). The teachings of the Holy Spirit consisted, not in whispering to them facts which they had not witnessed, but rather in reviving the fading remembrance, and throwing out into their true importance events and sayings that had been esteemed too lightly at the time they took place. But the Apostles could not have spoken of the Spirit as they did (Acts v. 32, xv. 28) unless he were known to be working in and with them and directing them, and manifesting that this was the case by unmistakable signs. Here is the answer, both to the question why was it not the first care of the Apostles to prepare a written Gospel, and also to the scruples of those who fear that the supposition of an oral Gospel would give a precedent for those views of tradition which have been the bane of the Christian Church as they were of the Jewish. The guidance of the Holy Spirit supplied for a time such aid as made a written Gospel unnecessary; but the Apostles saw the dangers and errors which a traditional Gospel would be exposed to in the course of time; and, while they were still preaching the oral Gospel in the strength of the Holy Ghost, they were admonished by the same divine person to prepare those written records which were hereafter to be the daily spiritual food of all the Church of Christ.* Nor is there any thing unnatural in the sup

position, that the Apostles intentionally uttered their witness in the same order, and even, for the most part, in the same form of words. They would thus approach most nearly to the condition in which the Church was to be when written books were to be the means of edification. They quote the Scriptures of the Old Testament frequently in their discourses; and as their Jewish education had accustomed them to the use of the words as well as the matter of the Bible, they would do no violence to their prejudices in assimilating the new records to the old, and in reducing them to a "*form of sound words*." They were all Jews of Palestine, of humble origin, all alike chosen, we may suppose, for the loving zeal with which they would observe the works of their Master and afterward propagate his name; so that the tendency to variance, arising from peculiarities of education, taste and character, would be reduced to its lowest in such a body. The language of their first preaching was the Syro-Chaldaic, which was a poor and scanty language; and though Greek was now widely spread, and was the language even of several places in Palestine (Josephus, *Ant.* xvii. 11, § 4; *Bell. Jud.* iii. 9, § 1), though it prevailed in Antioch, whence the first missions to Greeks and Hellenists, or Jews who spoke Greek, proceeded (Acts xi. 20, xiii. 1-3), the Greek tongue, as used by Jews, partook of the poverty of the speech which it replaced; as, indeed, it is impossible to borrow a whole language without borrowing the habits of thought upon which it has built itself. While modern taste aims at a variety of expression, and abhors a repetition of the same phrases as monotonous, the simplicity of the men, and their language, and their education, and the state of literature, would all lead us to expect that the Apostles would have no such feeling. As to this, we have more than mere conjecture to rely on. Occasional repetitions occur in the Gospels (Luke vii. 19, 20, xix. 31, 34), such as a writer in a more copious and cultivated language would perhaps have sought to avoid. In the Acts, the conversion of St. Paul is three times related (Acts ix., xxii., xxvi.), once by the writer and twice by St. Paul himself; and the two first harmonize exactly, except as to a few expressions and as to one more important circumstance (ix. 7=xxii. 9)—which, however, admits of an explanation—while the third deviates somewhat more in expression, and has one passage peculiar to itself. The vision of Cornelius is also three times related (Acts x. 3-6, 30-32, xi. 13, 14), where the words of the angel in the two first are almost precisely alike, and the rest very similar, while the other is an abridged account of the same facts. The vision of Peter is twice related (Acts x. 10-16, xi. 5-10), and, except in one or two expressions, the agreement is verbally exact. These places from the Acts, which, both as to their resemblance and their difference, may be compared to the narratives of the Evangelists, show the same tendency to a common form of narrative which, according to the present view, may have influenced the preaching of the

³ The opening words of St. Luke's Gospel, "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," appear to mean that many persons who heard the preaching of the Apostles wrote down what they heard, in order to preserve it in a permanent form. The word

"many" can not refer to St. Matthew and St. Mark only; and if the passage implies an intention to supersede the writings alluded to, then these two Evangelists can not be included under them. Partial and incomplete reports of the preaching of the Apostles, written with a good aim, but without authority, are intended: and, if we may argue from St. Luke's sphere of observation, they were probably composed by Greek converts.

Apostles. It is supposed, then, that the preaching of the Apostles, and the teaching whereby they prepared others to preach, as they did, would tend to assume a common form, more or less fixed ; and that the portions of the three Gospels which harmonize most exactly owe their agreement, not to the fact that they were copied from each other, although it is impossible to say that the later writer made no use of the earlier one, nor to the existence of any original document now lost to us, but to the fact that the apostolic preaching had already clothed itself in a settled or usual form of words, to which the writers inclined to conform without feeling bound to do so ; and the differences which occur, often in the closest proximity to the harmonies, arise from the feeling of independence with which each wrote what he had seen and heard, or, in the case of Mark and Luke, what apostolic witnesses had told him. The harmonies, as we have seen, begin with the baptism of John ; that is, with the consecration of the Lord to his Messianic office ; and with this event probably the ordinary preaching of the Apostles would begin, for its purport was that Jesus is the Messiah, and that as Messiah he suffered, died and rose again. They are very frequent as we approach the period of the Passion, because the sufferings of the Lord would be much in the mouth of every one who preached the Gospel, and all would become familiar with the words in which the Apostles described it. But as regards the Resurrection, which differed from the Passion in that it was a fact which the enemies of Christianity felt bound to dispute (Matt. xxviii. 15), it is possible that the divergence arose from the intention of each Evangelist to contribute something toward the weight of evidence for this central truth. Accordingly, all the four, even St. Mark (xvi. 14), who oftener throws a new light upon old ground than opens out new, mention distinct acts and appearances of the Lord to establish that he was risen indeed. The verbal agreement is greater where the words of others are recorded, and greatest of all where they are those of Jesus, because here the apostolic preaching would be especially exact ; and where the historical fact is the utterance of certain words, the duty of the historian is narrowed to a bare record of them.

That this opinion would explain many of the facts connected with the text is certain. Whether, besides conforming to the words and arrangement of the apostolic preaching, the Evangelists did in any cases make use of each other's work or not, it would require a more careful investigation of details to discuss than space permits. Every reader would probably find on examination some places which could best be explained on this supposition. Nor does this involve a sacrifice of the independence of the narrator. If each of the three drew the substance of his narrative from the one common strain of preaching that everywhere prevailed, to have departed entirely in a written account from the common form of words to which Christian ears were beginning to be familiar, would not have been independence but willfulness. To follow here and there the words and arrangement of another written Gospel already current, would not compromise the writer's independent position. If the principal part of the narrative was the voice of the whole Church, a few portions might be conformed to another writer without altering the character of the testimony. However close may be the agreement of the Evangelists, the independent position of each appears from the contents of his book, and has been recognized by writers of all ages. It will appear that St. Matthew describes the kingdom of Messiah, as founded in the Old Testament and fulfilled in Jesus of Naz-

areth ; that St. Mark, with so little of narrative peculiar to himself, brings out by many minute circumstances a more vivid delineation of our Lord's completely human life ; that St. Luke puts forward the work of Redemption as a universal benefit, and shows Jesus not only as the Messiah of the chosen people but as the Saviour of the world ; that St. John, writing last of all, passed over most of what his predecessors had related, in order to set forth more fully all that he had heard from the Master who loved him, of His relation to the Father, and of the relation of the Holy Spirit to both. The independence of the writers is thus established ; and if they seem to have here and there used each other's account, which it is perhaps impossible to prove or disprove, such cases will not compromise that claim which alone gives value to a plurality of witnesses.

§ 5. How does this last theory bear upon our belief in the inspiration of the Gospels ? This momentous question admits of a satisfactory reply. Our blessed Lord, on five different occasions, promised to the Apostles the divine guidance, to teach and enlighten them in their dangers (Matt. x. 19 ; Luke xii. 11, 12 ; Mark xiii. 11 ; and John xiv., xv., xvi.). He bade them take no thought about defending themselves before judges ; he promised them the Spirit of Truth to guide them into all truth, to teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance. That this promise was fully realized to them the history of the Acts sufficiently shows. But if the divine assistance was given them in their discourses and preaching, it would be rendered equally when they were about to put down in writing the same Gospel which they preached ; and, as this would be their greatest time of need, the aid would be granted them most surely. So that, as to St. Matthew and St. John, we may say that their Gospels are inspired because the writers of them were inspired, according to their Master's promise ; for it is impossible to suppose that he who put words into their mouths when they stood before a human tribunal, with no greater fear than that of death before them, would withhold his light and truth when the want of them would mislead the whole Church of Christ and turn the light that was in it into darkness. The case of the other two Evangelists is somewhat different. It has always been held that they were under the guidance of Apostles in what they wrote—St. Mark under that of St. Peter, and St. Luke under that of St. Paul. We are not expressly told indeed that these Evangelists themselves were persons to whom Christ's promises of supernatural guidance had been extended, but it certainly was not confined to the twelve to whom it was originally made, as the case of St. Paul himself proves, who was admitted to all the privileges of an apostle, though, as it were, "born out of due time ;" and as St. Mark and St. Luke were the companions of apostles—shared their dangers, confronted hostile tribunals, had to teach and preach—there is reason to think that they equally enjoyed what they equally needed. In Acts xv. 28, the Holy Ghost is spoken of as the common guide and light of all the brethren, not of apostles only ; nay, to speak it reverently, as one of themselves. So that the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke appear to have been admitted into the canon of Scripture as written by inspired men in free and close communication with inspired apostles. But supposing that the portion of the three first Gospels which is common to all has been derived from the preaching of the apostles in general, then it is drawn directly from a source which we know from our Lord himself to have been inspired. It comes to us from those apostles into whose mouths Christ

promised to put the words of his Holy Spirit. It is not from an anonymous writing, as Eichhorn thinks—it is not that the three witnesses are really one, as Storr and others have suggested in the theory of copying—but that the daily preaching of all apostles and teachers has found three independent transcribers in the three Evangelists. Now the inspiration of an historical writing will consist in its truth, and in its selection of events. Every thing narrated must be substantially and exactly true, and the comparison of the Gospels one with another offers us nothing that does not answer to this test. There are differences of arrangement of events; here some details of a narrative or a discourse are supplied which are wanting there; and if the writer had professed to follow a strict chronological order, or had pretended that his record was not only true but complete, then one inversion of order, or one omission of a syllable, would convict him of inaccuracy. But if it is plain—if it is all but avowed—that minute chronological data are not part of the writer's purpose—if it is also plain that nothing but a selection of the facts is intended, or, indeed, possible (John xxi. 25)—then the proper test to apply is, whether each gives us a picture of the life and ministry of Jesus of Nazareth that is self-consistent and consistent with the others, such as would be suitable to the use of those who were to believe on his Name—for this is their evident intention. About the answer there should be no doubt. We have seen that each Gospel has its own features, and that the divine element has controlled the human, but not destroyed it. But the picture which they conspire to draw is one full of harmony. The Saviour they all describe is the same loving, tender guide of his disciples, sympathizing with them in the sorrows and temptations of earthly life, yet ever ready to enlighten that life by rays of truth out of the infinite world where the Father sits upon his throne. It has been said that St. Matthew portrays rather the human side, and St. John the divine; but this holds good only in a limited sense. It is in St. John that we read that “Jesus wept;” and there is nothing, even in the last discourse of Jesus, as reported by St. John, that opens a deeper view of his divine nature than the words in St. Matthew (xi. 25-30) beginning, “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes.” All reveal the same divine and human Teacher; four copies of the same portrait, perhaps with a difference of expression yet still the same, are drawn here, and it is a portrait the like of which no one had ever delineated before, or, indeed, could have done, except from having looked on it with observant eyes, and from having had the mind opened by the Holy Spirit to comprehend features of such unspeakable radiance. Not only does this highest “harmony of the Gospels” manifest itself to every pious reader of the Bible, but the lower harmony—the agreement of fact and word in all that relates to the ministry of the Lord, in all that would contribute to a true view of his spotless character—exists also, and can not be denied. For example, all tell us alike that Jesus was transfigured on the mount; that the *shekinah* of divine glory shone upon his face; that Moses the lawgiver and Elijah the prophet talked with him; and that the voice from heaven bare witness to him. Is it any imputation upon the truth of the histories that St. Matthew alone tells us that the witnesses fell prostrate to the earth, and that Jesus raised them? or, that St. Luke alone tells us that for a part of the time they were heavy with sleep? Again, one Evangelist, in describing our Lord's temptation,

follows the order of the occurrences, another arranges them according to the degrees of temptation, and the third, passing over all particulars, merely mentions that our Lord *was* tempted. Is there any thing here to shake our faith in the writers as credible historians? Do we treat other histories in this exacting spirit? Is not the very independence of treatment the pledge to us that we have really three witnesses to the fact that Jesus was tempted like as we are? for if the Evangelists were copyists, nothing would have been more easy than to remove such an obvious difference as this. The histories are true according to any test that should be applied to a history; and the events that they select—though we could not presume to say that they were more important than what are omitted, except from the fact of the omission—are at least such as to have given the whole Christian Church a clear conception of the Redeemer's life, so that none has ever complained of insufficient means of knowing him.

There is a perverted form of the theory we are considering, which pretends that the facts of the Redeemer's life remained in the state of an oral tradition till the latter part of the second century, and that the Four Gospels were not written till that time. The difference is not of degree, but of kind, between the opinion that the Gospels were written during the lifetime of the Apostles, who were eye-witnesses, and the notion that for nearly a century after the oldest of them had passed to his rest the events were only preserved in the changeable and insecure form of an oral account. But for the latter opinion there is not one spark of historical evidence. Heretics of the second century, who would gladly have rejected and exposed a new Gospel that made against them, never hint that the Gospels are spurious; and orthodox writers ascribe without contradiction the authorship of the books to those whose name they bear. The theory was invented to accord with the assumption that miracles are impossible, but upon no evidence whatever; and the argument, when exposed, runs in this vicious circle:—"There are no miracles, therefore the accounts of them must have grown up in the course of a century from popular exaggeration; and as the accounts are not contemporaneous, it is not proved that there are miracles!" That the Jewish mind in its lowest decay should have invented the character of Jesus of Nazareth, and the sublime system of morality contained in his teaching—that four writers should have fixed the popular impression in four plain, simple, unadorned narratives, without any outbursts of national prejudice, or any attempt to give a political tone to the events they wrote of—would be in itself a miracle harder to believe than that Lazarus came out at the Lord's call from his four-days' tomb.

§ 6. TABLE OF THE HARMONY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.


N.B.—In the following Table, where all the references under a given section are printed in thick type, as under "Two Genealogies," it is to be understood that some special difficulty begets the harmony. Where one or more references under a given section are in thin, and one or more in thick type, it is to be understood that the former are given as in their proper place, and that it is more or less doubtful whether the latter are to be considered as parallel narratives or not.

| | ST. MATTHEW | ST. MARK. | ST. LUKE. | ST. JOHN. |
|---|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|
| "The Word" | .. | .. | .. | I. 1-14 |
| Preface, to Theophilus | .. | .. | I. 1-4 | .. |
| Annunciation of the Baptist's Birth | .. | .. | I. 5-25 | .. |
| Annunciation of the birth of Jesus | .. | .. | I. 26-38 | .. |
| Mary visits Elizabeth | .. | .. | I. 39-56 | .. |
| Birth of John the Baptist | .. | .. | I. 57-80 | .. |
| Birth of Jesus Christ | I. 18-25 | .. | II. 1-7 | .. |
| Two Genealogies | I. 1-17 | .. | III. 23-38 | .. |
| The watching Shepherds | .. | .. | II. 8-20 | .. |
| The Circumcision | .. | .. | II. 21 | .. |
| Presentation in the Temple | .. | .. | II. 22-38 | .. |
| The wise men from the East | II. 1-12 | .. | .. | .. |
| Flight to Egypt | II. 13-23 | .. | II. 39 | .. |
| Disputing with the Doctors | .. | .. | II. 40-52 | .. |
| Ministry of John the Baptist | III. 1-12 | I. 1-8 | III. 1-18 | I. 15-31 |
| Baptism of Jesus Christ | III. 13-17 | I. 9-11 | III. 21, 22 | I. 32-34 |
| The Temptation | IV. 1-11 | I. 12, 13 | IV. 1-13 | .. |
| Andrew and another see Jesus | .. | .. | .. | I. 35-40 |
| Simon, now Cephas (Peter) | .. | .. | .. | I. 41-42 |
| Philip and Nathanael | .. | .. | .. | I. 43-51 |
| The water made wine | .. | .. | .. | II. 1-11 |
| PASSOVER (1st) and cleansing the Temple } | .. | .. | .. | II. 12-23 |
| Nicodemus | .. | .. | .. | II. 23-III. 21 |
| Christ and John Baptizing | .. | .. | .. | III. 22-36 |
| The woman of Samaria | .. | .. | .. | IV. 1-42 |
| John the Baptist in prison | IV. 12; xiv. 8 | I. 14; vi. 17 | III. 19, 20 | III. 24 |
| Return to Galilee | IV. 12 | I. 14, 15 | IV. 14, 15 | IV. 43-45 |
| The synagogue at Nazareth | .. | .. | IV. 16-30 | .. |
| The nobleman's son | .. | .. | .. | IV. 46-54 |
| Capernaum. Four Apostles called | IV. 13-22 | I. 16-20 | V. 1-11 | .. |
| Demoniac healed there | .. | I. 21-28 | IV. 31-37 | .. |
| Simon's wife's mother healed | VIII. 14-17 | I. 29-34 | IV. 38-41 | .. |
| First Circuit round Galilee | IV. 23-25 | I. 35-39 | IV. 42-44 | .. |
| Healing a leper | VIII. 1-4 | I. 40-45 | V. 12-16 | .. |
| Christ stills the storm | VIII. 18-27 | IV. 35-41 | VIII. 22-25 | .. |
| Demoniacs in land of Gadarenes | VIII. 28-34 | V. 1-20 | VIII. 26-39 | .. |
| Jairus's daughter. Woman healed | IX. 18-26 | V. 21-43 | VIII. 40-56 | .. |
| Blind men, and demoniac | IX. 27-34 | .. | .. | .. |
| Healing the paralytic | IX. 1-8 | II. 1-12 | V. 17-26 | .. |
| Matthew the Publican | IX. 9-13 | II. 13-17 | V. 27-32 | .. |
| "Thy disciples fast not" | IX. 14-17 | II. 18-23 | V. 33-39 | .. |
| Journey to Jerusalem } | .. | .. | .. | V. 1. |
| 1st to 2d PASSOVER } | .. | .. | .. | V. 2-47 |
| Pool of Bethesda. Power of Christ | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| Plucking ears of corn on Sabbath | XII. 1-3 | II. 23-28 | VI. 1-5 | .. |
| The withered hand. Miracles | XII. 9-21 | III. 1-12 | VI. 6-11 | .. |
| The Twelve Apostles | X. 2-4 | III. 18-19 | VI. 12-16 | .. |
| The Sermon on the Mount | V. 1-vii. 29 | .. | VI. 17-49 | .. |
| The centurion's servant | VIII. 5-13 | .. | VII. 1-10 | IV. 46-54 |
| The widow's son at Nain | .. | .. | VII. 11-17 | .. |
| Messengers from John | XI. 2-19 | .. | VII. 18-35 | .. |
| Woe to the cities of Galilee | XI. 20-24 | .. | .. | .. |
| Call to the meek and suffering | XI. 25-30 | .. | .. | .. |
| Anointing the feet of Jesus | .. | .. | VII. 36-50 | .. |

| | ST. MATTHEW | ST. MARK. | ST. LUKE | ST. JOHN. |
|---|-------------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| <i>Second Circuit round Galilee</i> . . . | | | viii. 1-3 | .. |
| Parable of the Sower . . . | xiii. 1-23 | iv. 1-20 | viii. 4-15 | .. |
| “ Candle under a Bushel . . . | .. | iv. 21-25 | viii. 16-18 | .. |
| “ the Growth of Seed . . . | .. | iv. 26-29 | .. | .. |
| “ the Wheat and Tares . . . | xiii. 24-30 | .. | .. | .. |
| “ Grain of Mustard Seed . . . | xiii. 31, 32 | iv. 30-32 | xiii. 18-19 | .. |
| “ Leaven . . . | xiii. 33 | .. | xiii. 20-21 | .. |
| On teaching by parables . . . | xiii. 34, 35 | iv. 33-34 | .. | .. |
| Wheat and tares explained . . . | xiii. 36-43 | .. | .. | .. |
| The treasure, the pearl, the net . . . | xiii. 44-52 | .. | .. | .. |
| His mother and his brethren . . . | xii. 46-50 | iii. 31-35 | viii. 19-21 | .. |
| Reception at Nazareth . . . | xiii. 53-58 | vi. 1-6 | .. | .. |
| <i>Third Circuit round Galilee</i> . . . | ix. 35-38; xi. 1 | vi. 6 | .. | .. |
| Sending forth the Twelve . . . | x. | vi. 7-13 | ix. 1-6 | .. |
| Herod's opinion of Jesus . . . | xiv. 1, 2 | vi. 14-16 | ix. 7-9 | .. |
| Death of John the Baptist . . . | xiv. 3-12 | vi. 17-29 | .. | .. |
| Approach of Passover (3d) . . . | .. | .. | .. | vi. 4 |
| Feeding of the five thousand . . . | xiv. 13-21 | vi. 30-44 | ix. 10-17 | vi. 1-15 |
| Walking on the sea . . . | xiv. 22-33 | vi. 45-52 | .. | vi. 16-21 |
| Miracles in Gennesaret . . . | xiv. 34-36 | vi. 53-56 | .. | .. |
| The bread of life . . . | .. | .. | .. | vi. 22-25 |
| The unwashed hands . . . | xv. 1-20 | vii. 1-23 | .. | .. |
| The Syro-Phœnician woman . . . | xv. 21-28 | vii. 24-30 | .. | .. |
| Miracles of healing . . . | xv. 29-31 | vii. 31-37 | .. | .. |
| Feeding of the four thousand . . . | xv. 32-39 | viii. 1-9 | .. | .. |
| The sign from heaven . . . | xvi. 1-4 | viii. 10-13 | .. | .. |
| The leaven of the Pharisees . . . | xvi. 5-12 | viii. 14-21 | .. | .. |
| Blind man healed . . . | .. | viii. 22-26 | .. | .. |
| Peter's profession of faith . . . | xvi. 13-19 | viii. 27-29 | ix. 18-20 | vi. 66-71 |
| The Passion foretold . . . | xvi. 20-28 | viii. 30-ix. 1 | ix. 21-27 | .. |
| The Transfiguration . . . | xvii. 1-9 | ix. 9-10 | ix. 28-36 | .. |
| Elijah . . . | xvii. 10-13 | ix. 11-13 | .. | .. |
| The lunatic healed . . . | xvii. 14-21 | ix. 14-29 | ix. 37-42 | .. |
| The Passion again foretold . . . | xvii. 22, 23 | ix. 30-32 | ix. 43-45 | .. |
| Fish caught for the tribute . . . | xvii. 24-27 | .. | .. | .. |
| The little child . . . | xviii. 1-5 | ix. 33-37 | ix. 46-48 | .. |
| One casting out devils . . . | .. | ix. 38-41 | ix. 49, 50 | .. |
| Offenses . . . | xviii. 6-9 | ix. 42-48 | xvii. 2 | .. |
| The lost sheep . . . | xviii. 10-14 | .. | xv. 4-7 | .. |
| Forgiveness of injuries . . . | xviii. 15-17 | .. | .. | .. |
| Binding and loosing . . . | xviii. 18-20 | .. | .. | .. |
| Forgiveness. Parable . . . | xviii. 21-35 | .. | .. | .. |
| “ Salted with fire ” . . . | .. | ix. 49-50 | .. | .. |
| Journey to Jerusalem . . . | .. | .. | ix. 51 | vii. 1-10 |
| Fire from heaven . . . | .. | .. | ix. 52-56 | .. |
| Answers to disciples . . . | viii. 19-22 | .. | ix. 57-62 | .. |
| The Seventy disciples . . . | .. | .. | x. 1-16 | .. |
| Discussions at Feast of Tabernacles . . . | .. | .. | .. | vii. 11-53 |
| Woman taken in adultery . . . | .. | .. | .. | viii. 1-11 |
| Dispute with the Pharisees . . . | .. | .. | .. | viii. 12-59 |
| The man born blind . . . | .. | .. | .. | ix. 1-41 |
| The good Shepherd . . . | .. | .. | .. | x. 1-21 |
| The return of the Seventy . . . | .. | .. | x. 17-24 | .. |
| The Good Samaritan . . . | .. | .. | x. 25-37 | .. |
| Mary and Martha . . . | .. | .. | x. 38-42 | .. |
| The Lord's Prayer . . . | vi. 9-13 | .. | xi. 1-4 | .. |
| Prayer effectual . . . | vii. 7-11 | .. | xi. 5-13 | .. |
| “ Through Beelzebub ” . . . | xii. 22-37 | iii. 20-30 | xi. 14-23 | .. |
| The unclean spirit returning . . . | xii. 43-45 | .. | xi. 24-28 | .. |
| The sign of Jonah . . . | xii. 38-42 | .. | xi. 29-32 | .. |
| The light of the body . . . | { v. 15. vi. }
22-23 | .. | xi. 33-36 | .. |
| The Pharisees . . . | xiii. | .. | xi. 37-54 | .. |
| What to fear . . . | x. 26-33 | .. | xii. 1-12 | .. |
| “ Master, speak to my brother ” . . . | .. | .. | xii. 13-15 | .. |
| Covetousness . . . | vi. 25-33 | .. | xii. 16-31 | .. |
| Watchfulness . . . | .. | .. | xii. 32-59 | .. |
| Galileans that perished . . . | .. | .. | xiii. 1-9 | .. |

| | ST. MATTHEW | ST. MARK. | ST. LUKE. | ST. JOHN. |
|--|--------------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| Woman healed on Sabbath . . . | | | xiii. 10-17 | .. |
| The grain of mustard seed . . . | xiii. 31, 32 | iv. 30-32 | xiii. 18, 19 | .. |
| The leaven . . . | xiii. 33 | .. | xiii. 20, 21 | .. |
| Toward Jerusalem . . . | .. | .. | xiii. 22 | .. |
| "Are there few that be saved?" . . . | .. | .. | xiii. 23-30 | .. |
| Warning against Herod . . . | .. | .. | xiii. 31-33 | .. |
| "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem" . . . | xxiii. 37-39 | .. | xiii. 34, 35 | .. |
| Drop-y healed on Sabbath day . . . | .. | .. | xiv. 1-6 | .. |
| Choosing the chief rooms . . . | .. | .. | xiv. 7-14 | .. |
| Parable of the Great Supper . . . | xxii. 1-14 | .. | xiv. 15-24 | .. |
| Following Christ with the Cross . . . | x. 37, 38 | .. | xiv. 25-35 | .. |
| Parables of Lost Sheep, Piece of Money, Prodigal Son, Unjust Steward, Rich Man and Lazarus } . . . | .. | .. | xv., xvi. | .. |
| Offenses . . . | xviii. 6-15 | .. | xvii. 1-4 | .. |
| Faith and merit . . . | xvii. 20 | .. | xvii. 5-10 | .. |
| The ten lepers . . . | .. | .. | xvii. 11-19 | .. |
| How the kingdom cometh . . . | .. | .. | xvii. 20-37 | .. |
| Parable of the Unjust Judge . . . | .. | .. | xviii. 1-8 | .. |
| "the Pharisee and Publican" . . . | .. | .. | xviii. 9-14 | .. |
| Divorce . . . | xix. 1-12 | x. 1-12 | .. | .. |
| Infants brought to Jesus . . . | xix. 13-15 | x. 13-16 | xviii. 15-17 | .. |
| The rich man inquiring . . . | xix. 16-26 | x. 17-27 | xviii. 18-27 | .. |
| Promises to the disciples . . . | xix. 27-30 | x. 28-31 | xviii. 28-30 | .. |
| Laborers in the vineyard . . . | xx. 1-16 | .. | .. | .. |
| Death of Christ foretold . . . | xx. 17-19 | x. 32-34 | xviii. 31-34 | .. |
| Request of James and John . . . | xx. 20-28 | x. 35-45 | .. | .. |
| Blind men at Jericho . . . | xx. 29-34 | x. 46-52 | xviii. 35-43 | .. |
| Zacchæus . . . | .. | .. | xix. 1-10 | .. |
| Parable of the Ten Talents . . . | xxv. 14-30 | .. | xix. 11-28 | .. |
| Feast of Dedication . . . | .. | .. | .. | x. 22-39 |
| Beyond Jordan . . . | .. | .. | .. | x. 40-42 |
| Raising of Lazarus . . . | .. | .. | .. | xi. 1-44 |
| Meeting of the Sanhedrim . . . | .. | .. | .. | xi. 45-53 |
| Christ in Ephraim . . . | .. | .. | .. | xi. 54-57 |
| Arrival at Bethany six days } before the Passover . . . | .. | .. | .. | xii. 1, 9 |
| The anointing by Mary . . . | xxvi. 6-13 | xiv. 8-9 | vii. 36-50 | xii. 2-8 |
| Plot against Him and Lazarus . . . | .. | .. | .. | xii. 10, 11 |
| Christ enters Jerusalem . . . | xxi. 1-11 | xi. 1-10 | xix. 29-44 | xii. 12-19 |
| Cleansing of the Temple (2d) . . . | xxi. 12-16 | xi. 15-18 | xix. 45-48 | ii. 13-22 |
| The barren fig-tree . . . | xxi. 17-22 | { xi. 11-14, }
19-23 | .. | .. |
| Pray, and forgive . . . | vi. 14, 15 | xi. 24-26 | .. | .. |
| "By what authority," etc . . . | xxi. 23-27 | xi. 27-33 | xx. 1-9 | .. |
| Parable of the Two Sons . . . | xxi. 28-32 | .. | .. | .. |
| "the Wicked Husbandmen" . . . | xxi. 33-46 | xii. 1-12 | xx. 9-19 | .. |
| "the Wedding Garment" . . . | xxii. 1-14 | .. | xiv. 16-24 | .. |
| The tribute-money . . . | xxii. 15-22 | xii. 13-17 | xx. 20-26 | .. |
| The state of the risen . . . | xxii. 23-33 | xii. 18-27 | xx. 27-40 | .. |
| The great Commandment . . . | xxii. 34-40 | xii. 28-34 | .. | .. |
| David's Son and David's Lord . . . | xxii. 41-46 | xii. 35-37 | xx. 41-44 | .. |
| Against the Pharisees . . . | xxiii. 1-39 | xii. 38-40 | xx. 45-47 | .. |
| The widow's mite . . . | .. | xii. 41-44 | xxi. 1-4 | .. |
| Christ's second coming . . . | xxiv. 1-51 | xiii. 1-37 | xxi. 5-38 | .. |
| Parable of the Ten Virgins . . . | xxv. 1-13 | .. | .. | .. |
| "the Talents" . . . | xxv. 14-30 | .. | xix. 11-28 | .. |
| The Last Judgment . . . | xxv. 31-46 | .. | .. | .. |
| Greeks visit Jesus. Voice } from heaven . . . | .. | .. | .. | xii. 20-36 |
| Reflections of John . . . | .. | .. | .. | xii. 36-50 |
| LAST PASSOVER (4th). } Jews conspire . . . | xxvi. 1-5 | xiv. 1, 2 | xxii. 1, 2 | .. |
| Judas Iscariot . . . | xxvi. 14-16 | xiv. 10, 11 | xxii. 3-6 | .. |
| Passchal Supper . . . | xxvi. 17-29 | xiv. 12-25 | xxii. 7-23 | xiii. 1-35 |
| Contention of the Apostles . . . | .. | .. | xxii. 24-30 | .. |
| Peter's fall foretold . . . | xxvi. 30-35 | xiv. 26-31 | xxii. 31-39 | xiii. 36-38 |

| | ST. MATTHEW | ST. MARK. | ST. LUKE. | ST. JOHN. |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Last Discourse. The depart-
ure; the Comforter | .. | .. | .. | xiv. 1-31 |
| The Vine and the Branches.
Abiding in love | .. | .. | .. | xv. 1-27 |
| Work of the Comforter in disciples | .. | .. | .. | xvi. 1-33 |
| The prayer of Christ | .. | .. | .. | xvii. 1-26 |
| Gethsemane | xxvi. 36-46 | xiv. 32-42 | xxii. 40-46 | xviii. 1 |
| The betrayal | xxvi. 47-56 | xiv. 43-52 | xxii. 47-58 | xviii. 2-11 |
| Before Annas (Caiaphas)
Peter's denial | { xxvi. 57,
58, 69-75 } | { xiv. 53,
54, 66-72 } | xxii. 54-62 | xviii. 12-27 |
| Before the Sanhedrim | xxvi. 59-68 | xiv. 55-65 | xxii. 63-71 | .. |
| Before Pilate | { xxvii. 1,
2, 11-14 } | xv. 1-5 | xxiii. 1-3 | xviii. 28 |
| The Traitor's death | xxvii. 3-10 | .. | .. | .. |
| Before Herod | .. | .. | xxiii. 4-11 | .. |
| Accusation and Condemnation | xxvii. 15-26 | xv. 6-15 | xxiii. 13-25 | { xviii. 29-40 }
xix. 1-16 |
| Treatment by the soldiers | xxvii. 27-31 | xv. 16-20 | xxiii. 36, 37 | xix. 2, 3 |
| The Crucifixion | xxvii. 32-38 | xv. 21-28 | xxiii. 26-34 | xix. 17-24 |
| The mother of Jesus | .. | .. | .. | xix. 25-27 |
| Mockings and railings | xxvii. 39-44 | xv. 29-32 | xxiii. 35-39 | .. |
| The malefactor | .. | .. | xxiii. 40-43 | .. |
| The death | xxvii. 50 | xv. 37 | xxiii. 46 | xix. 28-30 |
| Darkness and other portents | xxvii. 45-53 | xv. 33-38 | xxiii. 44, 45 | .. |
| The by-standers | xxvii. 54-56 | xv. 39-41 | xxiii. 47-49 | .. |
| The side pierced | .. | .. | .. | xix. 31-37 |
| The burial | xxvii. 57-61 | xv. 42-47 | xxiii. 50-56 | xix. 38-42 |
| The guard of the sepulchre | { xxvii. 62-66 }
{ xxviii. 11-15 } | .. | .. | .. |
| The Resurrection | xxviii. 1-10 | xvi. 1-11 | xxiv. 1-12 | xx. 1-18 |
| Disciples going to Emmaus | .. | xvi. 12, 13 | xxiv. 13-35 | .. |
| Appearances in Jerusalem | .. | xvi. 14-18 | xxiv. 36-49 | xx. 19-29 |
| At the Sea of Tiberias | .. | .. | .. | xxi. 1-23 |
| On the Mount in Galilee | xxviii. 16-20 | .. | .. | .. |
| Unrecorded Works | .. | .. | .. | { xx. 30-31; }
xxi. 24, 25 } |
| Ascension | .. | xvi. 19-20 | xxiv. 50-58 | .. |



Jerusalem.

BOOK III.

HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES; OR, THE FOUNDING OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE CHURCH IN PALESTINE TO THE DISPERSION OF THE CHRISTIANS FROM JERUSALEM. A.D. 30-37.

- § 1. The *Acts of the Apostles* not a complete apostolic history—Its real purpose—Break between it and the earliest Ecclesiastical History. § 2. The Primitive Church in its two sections, Galilean and Judean—The 120 brethren at Jerusalem. § 3. Choice of Matthias to be an Apostle in place of Judas. § 4. The *Day of Pentecost*, or *Whitsunday*, 6th of Sivan, May 27th, A.D. 30—Descent of the Holy Ghost—Gift of the Spirit—The Disciples speak with Tongues—Effects on the People—St. Peter's Sermon—The 3000 converts—Practical reformation—State of the Primitive Church. § 5. Healing of the Lame Man at the Temple—St. Peter's second discourse—Peter and John before the Sanhedron.—Their dismissal—Thanksgivings of the Church and new effusion of

the Holy Ghost—Community of goods. § 6. The Sin and Judgment of Ananias and Sapphira—Its effect upon the people. § 7. Imprisonment and deliverance of the Apostles—Their boldness before the Sanhedrim—The counsel of Gamaliel. § 8. Beginning of positive institutions in the Church—Dissension between the Hellenists and the Hebrews—Appointment of the Seven Deacons—Their zeal for the Gospel. § 9. Success of Stephen in controversy with the Hellenistic Jews—His defense before the Sanhedrim—His martyrdom, and Saul's share in it. § 10. General persecution, and dispersion of the disciples from Jerusalem—Diffusion of the Gospel—Three steps: Samaria, Ethiopian eunuch, Cornelius—Philip at Samaria—Simon Magnus and Peter. § 11. The Ethiopian eunuch converted and baptized by Philip—Philip fixes his abode at Cæsarea. § 12. Position of the Christian Church at the death of TIBERIUS.

§ 1. ST. LUKE'S "Second Treatise" or Discourse,¹ addressed to Theophilus, bears a title apt to mislead the reader; a title certainly not given to it by its author. It contains no full account of the "Acts of the Apostles." Most of them are never mentioned even by name, after the list given in the first chapter; and the history of St. Paul is not brought down to his death. Its true subject is *the fulfillment of the promise of the Father by the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the results of that outpouring, in the diffusion of the Gospel among Jews and Gentiles.* It deals only with the *beginning* of this great theme; and, having shown us the full establishment of Christ's Church, first in the Holy Land, then in those Eastern and Grecian provinces of the Roman empire which the Jews were wont to regard as representing the whole Gentile world, and finally at Rome, it leaves all the future progress of the Gospel to be recorded by the Church itself.

And the point where the sacred history thus breaks off is marked by a most striking change in the character of the records. There is a great gulf between the last verses of the "Acts" and the last allusions in the Epistles of St. Paul, and the earliest authentic chapters of what is called "Ecclesiastical History." The chasm is only bridged over by traditions of uncertain value, in which even the martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul is disfigured by childish legends, and worldly principles are already seen at work in the kingdom of Christ.

§ 2. In describing the history before us as that of the *foundation* of the Christian Church, we use the word in its wider sense. The foundation stone was laid, in Christ's own person, when he was shown to Israel by his baptism; and the

¹ This title is implied in the opening words, in which he refers to his Gospel as τὸν πρῶτον λόγον, Acts i. 1.

disciples whom he gathered formed a perfect Church when he left them, at his ascension, with the commission to go forth and preach the Gospel to every creature. Nay, more: this Church already exhibited that condition which subsequently led to the greatest difficulties and divisions. In theory, and according to the declarations of Christ himself, it formed *one body*, like the *congregation* of the Jewish people, from which it derived both its name and the model of its constitution.² But that body was already practically divided into parts,—the Christians of Judæa and of Galilee, besides those of Samaria, Peræa, and the more distant countries round. The assumption that all these, who were not absolutely prevented, were gathered in waiting at Jerusalem, by the command of Jesus, is excluded by a curious proof. We have seen that the disciples who met Jesus on the mountain in Galilee were five hundred in number; but when Peter first stood up to address the disciples assembled at Jerusalem, “the number of the names together were about one hundred and twenty” only.³ How these were made up, we may infer from what we read just before—that the eleven Apostles, having returned from the Mount of Olives, assembled in an upper room, with the mother and brethren of Jesus and the women who had ministered to him, and there abode in prayer and supplication. Their evenings were thus spent; for in the day-time, “they were continually in the Temple, praising and blessing God,” doubtless declaring Christ’s resurrection and ascension to the people.⁴ These, then, with the other disciples resident in Jerusalem, made up the one hundred and twenty brethren; and at first sight they seem to act as the whole Church, in the election of the new Apostle. But a closer consideration will perhaps show that this election was conducted by the Apostles, in the presence and with the sanction of the brethren at Jerusalem, rather than as an act of the whole Church. On the day of Pentecost, however, when the Holy Spirit was poured out on the disciples, the great body of the believers were no doubt present, having come up to keep the feast at Jerusalem;⁵ and it was then that they were first seen in public as the Church of Christ.

² It is not the purpose of this work to discuss ecclesiastical questions; and therefore we must abstain from proving the points assumed in the text:—that the Christian *Church* is modeled on the Jewish *Congregation*, and that the word *ἐκκλησία* is simply the trans-

lation of the Hebrew word signifying “congregation” (Ps. xxii. 22).

³ Acts i. 15.

⁴ Acts i. 12-14; Luke xxiv. 53.

⁵ This seems to be indicated by the phrase, “They were *all* with one accord in one place.”

§ 3. Among the Apostles and disciples, Peter occupies the place assigned to him by Christ when he gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. It was his office to open the doors of the Church, first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles, while his brethren labored equally with him to bring the converts in. While waiting for the Spirit to qualify them for the work, Peter invited them to fill up the vacancy in the number of the Apostles caused by the fall of Judas. He lays down the first essential qualification for the apostolic office—the having been one of the companions of Christ from his baptism by John till his ascension—and declares the object of the election, “to be a witness with us of his resurrection.” Two such men were chosen, either by the Apostles or by the disciples, whose choice in either case supplied a testimony to their character; but the ultimate decision was referred to God himself by the sacred trial of the lot, accompanied by prayer. The two were JOSEPH, also called Barsabas,⁶ and surnamed the Just, and MATTHIAS; and the lot fell upon the latter.⁷

§ 4. Ten days after the ascension, the time arrived which God had appointed for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the disciples. “The day of Pentecost was fully come;” the first and great day of the feast of the full ingathering of the harvest.⁸ It was called by the Jews the “Feast of Weeks,” and in Greek Pentecost (*the fiftieth day*) because it fell on the day after the completion of seven weeks from the second, or great day, of the feast of unleavened bread. It brought to Jerusalem a greater concourse of Jews and proselytes from all parts of the world than any other of the three great festivals. Hence the season was as well chosen for the first proc-

⁶ The only other record we have of Barsabas is the story of Papias, that he drank a deadly poison unharmed, possibly an invention to complete the fulfillment of Mark xvi. 18. Papias calls him Judas Barsabas, a name which appears in Acts xv. 22 as that of one of the chief disciples.

⁷ Acts i. 15-26. For what is known of Matthias, see the supplementary account of the Apostles. According to Grotius, the lot was taken by means of two urns. (In Prov. xvi. 33, the word translated *lap* probably signifies *urn*). In one they placed two rolls of paper, with the names of Joseph and Matthias written within them;

and in the other two rolls, one with the word *Apostle*, and the other blank; and one roll was drawn from each urn simultaneously.

⁸ Acts ii. 1. On the Feast of Pentecost see *O. T. Hist.*, Appendix to Book III., Section VI. § 11. Seven weeks were reckoned from the 16th of Nisan, and the following day, the 6th of Sivan, was the day of Pentecost. Since in A.D. 80 the 16th of Nisan fell, as we have seen, on Saturday the 7th of April, the day of Pentecost fell on *Sunday*, May 27th. Hence the festival has been perpetuated in the Christian Church as *Whitsunday*.

lamation of our Lord's resurrection and ascension, as its occasion and its rites were symbolical of the first-fruit of the spiritual harvest, which were offered to God as the result of Peter's preaching.

On this day, the disciples, including those who had come up to the feast, were all gathered by common consent;⁹ when there was heard the sound of a rushing wind, as it were descending from heaven, and filling the house where they were sitting, while lambent flames, shaped like cloven tongues, were seen upon all their heads. These signs at once furnished to the senses a double evidence of some divine power, and exactly corresponded to the figurative language chosen by Jesus to describe the operations of the Holy Spirit:—a baptism of *fire*—a *wind* blowing where God wills, whose *sound* we hear, but can not trace its path. That Spirit was given to qualify the disciples for their work as witnesses of Christ, as he had said, “enduing them with power from on high.” It was to work *within*, “guiding them into all truth;”¹⁰ not only enabling them to remember all that Jesus had said to them,¹¹ but opening their minds to understand the truths concealed as yet under his words.¹² With spiritual discernment it brought spiritual life, all those moral virtues and graces which St. Paul calls “the fruit of the Spirit.”¹³

These *inward gifts* of the Spirit remained to be proved by the future course of the disciples; but other *external gifts* were at once made manifest, as a public proof of their endowment for their work. These were the “*extraordinary gifts of the Spirit*,” gifts, that is, miraculous in their nature; and like other miraculous works, they were designed partly indeed for their direct use, but still more as the *sign* of a divine mission.¹⁴ Perhaps the most striking of these gifts, and certainly the one best suited to the present occasion, was the power of “speaking with tongues,” that is, in foreign languages.¹⁵ This gift, conferred on illiterate Galileans, at once enabled them to address the various strangers assembled at the feast, each in his own language, and gave to those so addressed a convincing proof that God was with the speakers,

⁹ The word *ὁμοθυμαδόν* seems to imply some impulse bringing them together in a state of excited expectation.

¹⁰ John xvi. 13. ¹¹ John xiv. 26.

¹² See especially John vii. 39.

¹³ Gal. v. 22-25; Eph. v. 9.

¹⁴ 1 Cor. xiv. 22. See the whole

discussion upon such gifts by St. Paul, in the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians.

¹⁵ The introduction of the word *unknown*, which does not occur in the N. T., has given some color to the absurd idea that these were tongues unknown to any human language.

and to themselves the assurance that they were to preach the Gospel to all nations and kindreds and tongues under heaven. How far the gift was permanent in those who received it does not appear. The statements of St. Paul prove that it was afterward by no means common to the whole body of believers, as it appears to have been on this day. That it was not intended to supersede the use of acquired learning, is proved by the choice of Paul himself as the Apostle of the Greeks; and the books of the New Testament bear marks of dialect, influenced, to say the least, by the natural powers of the writers.

This gift, bestowed at the moment of the descent of the cloven tongues of fire, about the time of the morning sacrifice, was immediately used by the Apostles and disciples in uttering the praises of God. The news soon spread through the city, and the multitude flocked together to the scene, confounded at hearing these Galileans speak in several languages.¹⁶ The passage furnishes an interesting enumeration of the provinces, and regions even beyond the Roman empire, in which Jews were found. The enumeration is not made at random, but follows a regular order from East to West, beginning with the *Parthians*, *Medes* and *Elamites*, beyond the Roman Empire, and the *Mesopotamians* on the frontier; then, crossing the desert, to *Judæa* (with which we may suppose Syria to be included); next proceeding northward, and circling round the peninsula of Asia Minor, we have *Cappadocia*, *Pontus*, proconsular *Asia*, *Phrygia*, and *Pamphylia*; whence the transition is natural across the Mediterranean, to *Egypt* and the parts of Libya about *Cyrene*; where, reaching the Western Provinces, the Mediterranean is recrossed to Rome itself, and the strength of the Jewish element in the population of Italy is attested by the phrase, "strangers of *Rome*, Jews and *Proselytes*;" and the list is concluded, somewhat less regularly, by the *Cretes* and *Arabians*.

An attempt was made to discredit the general feeling that all this had some strange meaning, by the taunting suggestion that the men were drunk with new wine. Upon this Peter spoke out; and, having repelled the charge by an appeal to the early hour (9 o'clock), a time at which none begin drinking in the East, he declared that what they saw was

¹⁶ Acts ii. 5-11. The words "Are not all these which speak, Galileans?" might favor the view that the Apostles only were the speakers; but the disciples were already so far identified with Galilee in common repute as to forbid our taking the phrase too literally.

the fulfillment of Joel's great prophecy concerning the descent of the Spirit upon all flesh in the last days; when wonders should be shown in heaven and earth, that men might call upon the name of Jehovah and be saved. Then plainly charging the people with their wickedness in crucifying Jesus, he declares his resurrection by the power of God to be the fulfillment of David's prophecy of Christ; and, inferring from that prophecy the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, he points to this which they now saw and heard as his first gift to men, and as a proof "that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ."

The appeal to their consciences was the more striking as, besides the rulers resident at Jerusalem, many other Jews, who had joined in the scenes enacted at the Passover, were now re-assembled at Jerusalem after six weeks' interval for reflection. At once the sting of conviction pierced their hearts; and their cry to Peter and the Apostles, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" was answered by the call to repentance, to be signified, as under John, by baptism, but now into the name of Christ, that their sins might be remitted and they might receive the Holy Ghost. This offer of mercy was followed by the assurance which, stamping upon the Christian Church the like family and social character to that which marked the community of Israel, extended the blessing to the Gentiles also:—"The promise is unto *you and to your children*, and to *all that are afar off*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Such were the chief points of this first apostolic sermon; but much more was added, and all was concluded with exhorting such as would to come out and separate themselves from this perverse generation. All who "*received the word*," that is, who simply professed faith in the truth preached by Peter, were baptized and added to the Church; and the pentecostal first-fruits thus offered to God were 3000 souls.¹⁷

Nor was this a passing excitement. The new converts became faithful disciples, adhering to the teachings of the Apostles and the fellowship of the Church; observing Christ's institution of breaking bread together, and constant in prayer. The four elements included in this summary of the daily life of the primitive Church deserve special notice:—(i.) The *Apostles' doctrine* included doubtless the whole body of divine truth, which was based on the writings of the Old Testa-

¹⁷ Acts ii. 14-41. It must be remembered that a large number of these would leave Jerusalem after the feast.

ment, viewed in the new light of the Spirit bestowed upon the Apostles to lead them into all truth, as well as their own testimony to the life and death and especially the resurrection of the Lord. (ii.) The *Fellowship*¹⁸—though the word is often used in the wider generic sense which is now most familiar to us—seems here, as in many other passages, to denote that *communication* of the goods of this life which was needful to supply the necessities of the poorer brethren, and the collection of which seems thus early to have formed a part of their united worship. (iii.) The *breaking of bread* alludes to the social custom which sprang up among this small community, severed much from the world around, of eating together daily, as well as to their use of such opportunities for celebrating the Lord's Supper: while (iv.) the distinct mention of *Prayer* vindicates its place as an act of common Christian worship against the specious fallacy that it is a matter solely between each man and his God. So great a movement struck awe even into those who did not join it; and this feeling was kept alive by the miracles which the Apostles wrought. The first practical fruit of the new faith was seen in a reform of one of the worst faults of the Jewish character—its selfish rapacity and oppression of the poor. Forming a closely united community,¹⁹ they regarded their possessions as given for their common use, according as the necessities of each required. To this so-called community of goods our attention will presently be recalled. Meanwhile we behold the Church in its first new-created purity, daily increased by sincere converts, and enjoying harmony within and the favor of the people without, before the beginning of persecution or declension.²⁰

§ 5. The healing of a man above forty years old, who had been lame from his birth, by Peter and John²¹ at the "Beautiful" gate of the Temple, in presence of all the people who were assembling to evening prayer, gave Peter another opportunity of preaching the Saviour, in whose name alone the miracle was performed. His discourse was interrupted by the priests of the Sadducean party, and the captain of the guard of Levites that kept order in the Temple, who seized the Apostles, and carried them off to prison. The pretext was, no doubt, that they excited a tumult in the Temple, but their

¹⁸ Not "the Apostles' fellowship," as the order in our version might suggest.

¹⁹ The phrase *ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ* certainly means this, whether or not it refers specifically to their assembling in one place.

²⁰ Acts ii. 42-47.

²¹ Acts iii. It is interesting to note the continuance of that close connection between these two Apostles, which we have already seen in the Gospels.

real offense was preaching the resurrection from the dead in the name of Jesus. But their arrest did not prevent their word being received by no less than 5000 believers.²²

In presence of the Sanhedrim, assembled the next morning under Annas and Caiaphas, the high-priests, with their Sadducean kindred, Peter boldly avowed, for John and himself, that the miracle had been performed in the name of Jesus, who, though crucified by them, had been raised by God; and whose name alone was given under heaven for the salvation of men. Then was fulfilled the promise of Christ, when he bade the disciples, on being brought before courts and rulers, to take no thought what they should say, for he would give them a mouth and wisdom which their adversaries should be unable to resist. Their freedom of speech, contrasted with their want of letters, left the council no doubt that they were worthy followers of Jesus; and the presence of the healed man forbade their denial of the miracle. So they resolved to try half-measures, commanding the Apostles to cease from speaking in the name of Jesus. Peter and John plainly refused the compromise:—"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. *For we can not but speak the things which we have seen and heard.*" Still the impression made upon the people by the miracle rendered it dangerous to attempt severity; and the council let the Apostles go, after renewing their threatenings. The assembled Church received them with a thanksgiving, which forms the earliest example of united Christian prayer; and in which three things deserve especial notice:—the use of Scripture models, including a direct quotation from the second Psalm; the recital of facts, as well as the language of actual supplication; and the exercise, in offering the latter, of that freedom of speech for the increase of which they prayed. The prayer was answered by another sign of God's presence, the shaking of the place in which they met, as Sinai was shaken of old;²³ it was answered by a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit. The work of the Apostles was resumed with fresh power; and the Church was endued still more manifestly with divine grace and harmony.²⁴

The poor, who formed the great body of the disciples, were

²² Acts iv. 1-4. That these five thousand included the three thousand converts of the day of Pentecost seems most probable in itself (compare iii. 11), and is quite consistent with the

form of expression, *καὶ ἐγενήθη ὁ ἀριθμὸς, κ. τ. λ.*, not, as in ii. 41, *προσέτιθησαν*.

²³ Comp. Haggai ii. 7, etc.

²⁴ Acts iv.

preserved from want by sharing the wealth of the rest, according to their necessities.

Not that the first Christians adopted the fantastic and impracticable theory, known in modern times by the name of *communism*, divesting themselves of individual property, and throwing all they had and earned into a common stock. They had indeed a common fund, which was divided by the Apostles among the poor; and those who carried into full effect the principle that "nought of the things which he possessed was his own" sold their lands and houses, and laid the price at the Apostles' feet. But that this practice was not binding upon all is proved by the stress laid on the self-sacrifice of Barnabas,²⁶ and by the express declaration of Peter to Ananias, that he might have kept the land, if he had chosen, or even have used its price after it was sold.²⁶ St. Luke's language is indeed universal;²⁷ but universal statements are always to be interpreted by more specific information. What was universally accepted was the principle that none should want while any of their brethren had the means of helping them; but, in carrying out this principle, they used that Christian liberty of beneficence which is far more effective than an enforced equality of wealth.

§ 6. And now we come to the second great crime which stained the profession of Christianity,—the treason of Judas having been the first,—and which called down a judgment as signal. As among the followers of Christ on earth, so in the early Church, the love of money was the root of evil; it was mingled with love of praise; and falsehood was the means of gratifying both. The story of Ananias and Sapphira is too familiar to need relation. They seem to have been prompted by the desire to share the credit gained by Joses, surnamed BARNABAS, a Levite of Cyprus, who sold his estate, and gave its price to the Apostles. They attempted to gain that praise, and yet to secure themselves from want, by keeping back a part of the price of their land, and bringing only the rest to the Apostles,—an acted lie, had it been left there. But Peter was moved by the Spirit to proclaim the deceit; and, so far from extenuating it because the lie had not been uttered, he passed on all such prevarication the awful sentence, "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God." The conduct of Sapphira is distinguished by the effrontery with which, in reply

²⁶ Acts iv. 36, 37. What we have to say of Barnabas is reserved for the sequel.

²⁶ Acts v. 4.

²⁷ Acts ii. 44, 45, iv. 32, 34.

to Peter's question, she uttered the direct lie. The judgment that fell on both was analogous to the "cutting off a soul from the congregation" under the old dispensation, and gave, thus early in the history of the Church, a terrible warning of God's absolute requirement of sincerity in all his people. It caused great fear within the Church, and deterred the worldly-minded from joining the disciples. But still the work of conversion went on. The Apostles and their followers assembled daily in the portico of the Temple named after Solomon. Their miracles were multiplied. The sick were carried on beds into the street, that at least Peter's shadow, as he passed by, might fall upon them; and multitudes were brought into Jerusalem from the villages, and were all healed.²⁸

§ 7. And this was all that the Sadducees had gained by their warning to Peter and John. Their indignation got the better of their policy, and they threw all the Apostles into prison. An angel opened the prison doors, and set them free during the night; and when the Sanhedrim assembled in the morning, it was to hear that the prison had been found secure and guarded, but empty; and that the prisoners were at that moment preaching in the Temple. Fear of the people again prevented open violence; but the Apostles came at the request of the captain of the temple-guard, and were placed before the Sanhedrim, whom the high-priest now convened, together with the Senate of Elders, that venerable body which had preserved its authority as representing the people through all the changes of the Jewish state.²⁹ In this second assembly, therefore, we see no longer only the Sanhedrim, headed by the Sadducean rulers, but the chiefs of the whole people taking part in persecuting the Apostles. To the charge that they were trying to bring upon the people the blood of Christ—that blood which these very men had invoked on their own heads—Peter replied with the same boldness as before, but with a different result. Stung by his words, they were about to vote the death of the Apostles, when they were checked by the advice of a Pharisee named GAMALIEL. This man, renowned as one of the greatest doctors of the law,³⁰ and still

²⁸ Acts v. 1-16.

²⁹ Acts v. 21: τὸ συνέδριον καὶ παῖσαν τὴν γερουσίαν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ.

³⁰ He is identified with the celebrated Jewish doctor Gamaliel, who is known by the title of "the glory of the law," and was the first to whom

the title "Rabban," "our master," was given. This Gamaliel was son of Rabbi Simeon, and grandson of the celebrated Hillel. He was president of the Sanhedrim under Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius, and is reported to have died eighteen years before the destruction of Jerusalem.

more as the preceptor of St. Paul,³¹ gave the sage counsel to wait and see what would come of the new doctrine, if let alone. It was an age of pretenders, such as Theudas and Judas of Galilee, who had ended by breaking out into open revolt and being destroyed by the power of Rome. Such too would be the end of these men, if they were impostors,—an end which would save the rulers trouble and danger. But another alternative was possible. The thing might be indeed from God; and if so, to overthrow it would be impossible, to resist it would incur the guilt of fighting against God. The emphatic clearness with which Gamaliel puts this, as far more than a bare possibility, throws a flood of light on the convictions of the learned and thinking men among the Pharisees, and helps us to form a juster estimate of Saul's guilt as a persecutor. The jealousy between the Sadducees and Pharisees moved the latter for the time to protect the teachers of a resurrection; but they soon surpassed their rivals in the fury of persecution. The advice of Gamaliel was adopted by the Council, whose anger needed, however, to be gratified by some punishment; so they inflicted on the Apostles the scourging permitted by the law, and let them go, again forbidding them to speak in the name of Jesus. Assured by this commencement of a share in their Saviour's suffering and shame, that he deemed them worthy to follow him, they continued, as before, to teach and preach Jesus Christ, both in the Temple and from house to house.³²

§ 8. Thus far we have met with no indications of any institutions for the government of the Church. None had been prescribed by Jesus; but he had taught his followers those principles which would guide them to institutions as they were wanted. As yet no such want had been felt: all had been supplied by the presence of the Apostles and the unbroken harmony of the brethren. But now came in the humiliating fact, which has ever since cast its shadow over the Church, that every development of doctrine and of discipline is the fruit of some error or imperfection. Doubtless more is gained than lost by the working of this principle; chiefly because it leaves all the glory to God, and shames man's boast of growing perfection.

There were two sorts of persons in the Church, the *Hebrews* and the *Hellenists*.³³ In their widest significance, the words

He was succeeded in the presidency of the Sanhedrim by his son Simeon, who perished in the siege.

³¹ Acts xxii. 3. ³² Acts v. 17-42.

³³ This word (Ἑλληνισταί, which our translators distinguish from "Ελ-

Hellenist and *Hellenism* described that engrafting of Greek influence upon a native stock which resulted from Alexander's conquest of Western Asia. The mere use of the Greek language, as it came to prevail in the conquered countries, converted a true native into a "Hellenist." Thus the Jews of Palestine came to apply the term to their brethren—though of Jewish blood as pure as theirs—who were scattered throughout the Gentile world. The use of a distinct name was sure to aid the sense of fancied superiority on the part of those possessing the Holy Land, the sacred city and the Temple; a claim which the Hellenists of course resented. These jealousies were carried into the Christian Church, which numbered many Hellenist converts as the result of Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost. The rapid increase of numbers had made it very difficult for the Apostles to distribute the common fund; and the first sufferers were naturally the widows, who, from the position held by women in the East, were at once the most needy and the least able to press their claims. It is very probable that the Hellenist widows, in particular, may have been neglected through being personally little known. At all events, this feeling rose up among the Hellenists; and they complained, not against the Apostles, but against the Hebrews, perhaps those who assisted the Apostles in the daily distribution. Instead of clinging to the influence conferred by these "temporalities," the Apostles welcomed the occasion for their relief from the "service of tables," which hindered their entire devotion to prayer and the ministry of the word. They desired the brethren to choose from among themselves seven men, at once held in es-

ληνες by rendering the former *Grecians* and the latter *Greeks*) is used in one other passage of the *Acts*, where Paul, on his first visit to Jerusalem, disputed, as Stephen had done, with the party whom he perhaps supposed most open to his arguments (*Acts* ix. 29). "Grecians" are also mentioned in the A.V., in the account of the foundation of the Church at Antioch (*Acts* xi. 20), where, however, the context seems to require the reading "Greeks" ("Ελληνες), which is supported by great external evidence, as the proper antithesis to "Jews" in v. 19: the word used in contradistinction to *Hellenists* being *Hebrews*. The name marks a class distinguished

by peculiar habits, and not by descent. Thus the Hellenists, as a body, included not only the proselytes of Greek (or foreign) parentage, but also those Jews who, by settling in foreign countries, had adopted the prevalent form of the current Greek civilization, and with it the use of the common Greek dialect, to the exclusion of the Aramaic, which was the national representative of the ancient Hebrew. Hellenism was thus a type of life, and not an indication of origin. Hellenists might be Greeks, but when the latter term is used ("Ελληνες, *John* xii. 20), the point of race and not of creed is that which is foremost in the mind of the writer.

teem for their character," and distinguished for wisdom and spiritual gifts, who were ordained to this office by the Apostles, with prayer and the imposition of hands."

Their names were STEPHEN, who is especially mentioned as full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas and Nicolas. The last was a proselyte of Antioch, and the Greek names of the rest favor the idea that they were Hellenists, which would give an additional security against any further ground for complaint."

There can be no reasonable doubt that these were the first DEACONS³⁷ of the Church, though that name is not used in the narrative. Doubtless the title *followed* the exercise of the office; and those who were at first called "the Seven"³⁸ received the name of "servants" from the service they performed.³⁹ In the Epistles of Paul, the name has already passed into a distinct official title, and the qualifications which he assigns to deacons correspond exactly to the functions of "the Seven."

This institution gave a fresh impulse to the Gospel. We have already seen a Levite (Barnabas) among the converts; but now the new religion was embraced by many of the priests:—"The word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." It was not merely that the Apostles obtained more freedom; but the deacons themselves came forward with a zeal suited to their eminent position. Chosen for their spiritual gifts, they were not likely to confine themselves to duties merely secular. Philip, "one of the seven," is also called "Philip the Evangelist;" and he was doubtless the same who converted the Samaritans, and received the Ethiopian eunuch into the Church."

³⁴ *Μαρτυροῦμεν*, witnessed-to.

³⁵ As a designation to the office, not a conferring of the Holy Spirit, for that was a previous qualification.

³⁶ Acts vi. 1-6.

³⁷ Some still dispute the point, but without good reason.

³⁸ Acts xxi. 8.

³⁹ The facility of the English language, in using a foreign word to distinguish a specific sense from the generic, often gives to a technical term an appearance of precision which it does not possess in the original. This is well seen if we re-trans-

late the generic word by the specific. In this case, we should find the mother of Jesus giving orders to the *deacons* at the marriage feast at Cana; the Apostle describing himself and his fellow-preachers as "able *deacons* of the New Covenant;" and, in classical Greek, Hermes the *deacon* of the Olympian deities.

⁴⁰ Acts viii. That this was not Philip the Apostle is clear from the action of the Apostles at Jerusalem, in sending Peter and John to give the Holy Spirit to the converts at Samaria.

Still more conspicuous was Stephen for his faith and the power of his teaching, and the wonders and miracles he performed. His zeal soon earned for him the glory of being the Protomartyr of the Christian Church.

§ 9. The success of Stephen was, for some reason, peculiarly odious to the Hellenistic Jews, who formed a sort of combined opposition to him. These opponents belonged to "the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of those from Cilicia and Asia."⁴¹ The Cyrenians and Alexandrians represented the Jews of Africa, who were very numerous in those two capitals. The Asiatics represent those of Western Asia in general, and not only of the province; and the express mention of the *Cilicians* prepares us for the part taken by SAUL OF TARSUS. Hitherto the Sadducees had taken the lead in resisting Christianity, chiefly from motives of policy; and the Pharisees had stood aloof, feeling some favor toward the teachers of a resurrection. But now the latter party were committed to the conflict by the zeal of the Hellenists for the traditions of the law. Worsteds in argument by Stephen's wisdom and spiritual power, they suborned (as against his Master) false witnesses, who accused him before the Sanhedrim of blasphemy against the Temple and the Law, in saying that Jesus of Nazareth should destroy the holy place and change the institutions of Moses. The presence which Christ had promised to his disciples was shown, before Stephen opened his lips, by the very aspect of his countenance, which seemed to all in the council like that of an angel.⁴²

The defense which he made, on the invitation of the high-priest, is one of the most memorable passages of the New Testament. It places the truth of Christianity on the basis of its relation to the history of the Old Covenant. That history is recounted, from the call of Abraham to the mission of Moses, to prove that, in the whole process of forming the Jewish state and laws, there was a gradually developed covenant and promise of better things, which was as constantly resisted by the unbelief and apostasy of the people. While thus laying the ground for retorting upon his accusers the

⁴¹ "Libertines" is a Latin word—*Libertini*—that is, "freedmen." The Libertini here mentioned are probably Jews who, having been taken prisoners by Pompey and other Roman generals in the Syrian wars, had been reduced to slavery, and had afterward

been emancipated, and returned, permanently or for a time, to the country of their fathers. Of the existence of a large body of Jews in this position at Rome we have abundant evidence.

⁴² Acts vi. 9 15.

charge that it was they and their fathers who had made void the law, he displays in the disobedience of the Israelites to Moses a prophetic sign of their own rebellion against the prophet whom God raised up, as he had raised him," nay, whom they had actually resisted in the person of the Angel who was with the congregation in the wilderness.

Then, as bearing upon the other charge of blasphemously foretelling the destruction of the Temple, he shows how, though they had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, they had plunged into every form of idolatry, and taken up the tabernacle of Moloch; and, passing on to the bringing in of the tabernacle by Joshua, and Solomon's performance of his father's desire to build a house for God, he comes boldly to the great point in dispute. Not in his own words, but in those used by Solomon himself at the very dedication of the Temple, and re-echoed by Isaiah, he declares that the Most High Jehovah has a truer and far nobler dwelling than any house that man can build him,—the temple of the universe which His own hand hath made, and of whose materials man can at best frame some small part into a house, which is God's work before it is theirs. The inference from the whole argument is that hypocrisy lay at the root of their pretended zeal for the Law they had ever broken and the Temple they had constantly profaned, while blind to the spiritual sense and use of both. Overpowered with holy indignation, the accused becomes the accuser, denouncing his judges as the betrayers and murderers of the Just One, each one of whose prophets their fathers had persecuted and slain. The whole argument is summed up in the one phrase, "Ye stiff-necked"—the epithet applied by Moses to their fathers,—"ye" who, while boasting of circumcision, are "uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: *as your fathers did, so do ye.*" The whole course of their history is brought to this point, that they themselves had never kept the law, which they falsely charged him with blaspheming, though they had "received it by the dispensation of angels."

Stung to their very hearts, they threw off all the restraints of a judicial court, gnashing their teeth for rage, as they cut short his defense. Amid the tumult, Stephen stood gazing up to heaven, and saying, with calm rapture,—“Behold I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God;”—not *sitting*, as is elsewhere said, but as it

⁴³ The phrase "a prophet like unto me" (v. 37) misleads the English reader.

were stepping forward to welcome the first martyr into heaven. Their rage now passed all bounds. Stopping their ears against his blasphemy, and not staying even to pass sentence, they rushed upon him as one man, hurried him out of the city, and stoned him to death. His last words were those of his Master on the cross, commending his spirit to the Lord Jesus himself, as to God, and praying for his murderers, that the sin might not be laid to their charge. "And when he had said this, *he fell asleep*," is the language in which the sacred writer closes the scene of violence with holy calmness, and with the glorious hope of an awakening to eternal life.⁴⁴ The zeal and courage of the same class of converts to which Stephen himself belonged, the Hellenists and proselytes, who are included under the general denomination of "devout men," honored his mangled remains with an amount of funeral state and lamentation expressed by two words which are used only here in the New Testament.⁴⁵

"The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church." Never was this more true than in the death of Stephen. Among the Hellenists of Cilicia, who had provoked the controversy, was "a young man named SAUL," a Jew of Tarsus, of the tribe of Benjamin, of the purest descent, who had been brought up a disciple of the great Rabban Gamaliel. We have his own testimony to that blind zeal for the law, which led him to take a part in Stephen's death only second to that of the witnesses themselves, by taking charge of their clothes, while they cast the first stones, as directed by the law; and we have too his own bitter and repeated confession of that great sin. Yet this was the very man raised up by God to supply the place of Stephen. St. Luke suggests this con-

⁴⁴ Ἐκοιμήθη: the word properly describes the retiring to rest in one's bed. The same truth is embodied in the beautiful name for a place of Christian burial, *cemetery* (κοιμητήριον, a *sleeping-place*), for which some have most perversely substituted the heathen *Necropolis*, as if they wished to contradict the words, "He is *not dead*, but *sleepeth*." The martyrdom of Stephen is connected with the disputed question, whether the Sanhedrim had at this time the power of inflicting death. The truth seems to be that their turbulent spirit was ever ready to break through the restraints imposed upon them by the Roman

government. The execution of Stephen seems to have been a tumultuous proceeding during a suspension of the Roman government, as will presently be seen. There was an occasion on which Christ himself narrowly escaped stoning within the precincts of the Temple (John viii. 59). The scene of the martyrdom has been variously fixed by tradition at the Damascus gate on the north of the city, and at the gate on the eastern wall at the end of the Via Dolorosa, now called St. Stephen's Gate.

⁴⁵ Acts viii. 2: συνεκόμισαν δὲ τὸν Στέφανον ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς καὶ ἔποιήσαντο κοπετὸν μέγαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

nection by the words, "And Saul was consenting to his death."⁴⁶

The saying of Augustin—"Si Stephanus non orasset, ecclesia Paulum non haberet"—beautifully expresses the view of Stephen's position as the forerunner of St. Paul. But it is an aspect that has been much more forcibly drawn out in modern times. Not only was his martyrdom (in all probability) the first means of converting St. Paul, in whose conversion Stephen's prayer for his murderers was fulfilled and whose conscience always bore the sting of that day's great crime; but in his doctrine also he was the anticipator, as, had he lived, he would have been the propagator, of the new phase of Christianity, of which St. Paul became the main support. His denunciations of local worship—the stress which he lays upon the spiritual side of Jewish history—his freedom in treating that history—the very turns of expression that he uses—are all Pauline. The discourses and epistles of St. Paul reproduce both the arguments and phraseology which he had heard from St. Stephen's lips; for we can not doubt that Paul was present in the Sanhedrim, though he was not qualified to vote."⁴⁷

The martyrdom of Stephen forms an epoch in the early history of the Church, the date of which is the more interesting on account of its bearing upon St. Paul's life. But the narrative in the *Acts* supplies us with no chronological data, from the day of Pentecost in A.D. 30 down to the famine under Claudius and the death of Herod Agrippa I. in A.D. 44. One tradition fixes the martyrdom of Stephen as early as A.D. 30; but it is quite incredible that the events of the first seven chapters of the *Acts* should have been crowded into a single year; nor could so early a date be reconciled with the few certain indications concerning the period of Paul's conversion. That this event followed at no long interval after Stephen's martyrdom seems clear; and various indications concur to place it somewhere within the limits of Caligula's four years' reign. Coming to narrower limits, we shall see presently that the strongest arguments and the best modern opinions concur in fixing the conversion of St. Paul about A.D. 37. Nor are we without some weighty independent evidence to confirm the

⁴⁶ Acts viii. 1: separated from their connection by the division of the chapters.

⁴⁷ Acts xvii. 24; Galatians iii. 19; Romans ii. 17-29. See Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*, chap. ii. In

the persecution, however, which followed the death of Stephen, Saul appears giving his vote as a full member of the Sanhedrim. Acts xxvi. 10: ἀναιρουμένων τε αὐτῶν κατήνευσε ψήφον.

date thus suggested for the martyrdom of St. Stephen. Such acts of violence, in contempt of the Roman prerogative of life and death, were usually perpetrated during a vacancy in the procuratorship of Judæa. An example occurs in the martyrdom of James the Just, in the interval between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus as his successor (A.D. 62); when, just like Stephen and those who suffered after him, James and other Christians were condemned by the Sanheddim, at the instance of the high-priest Ananus, and stoned to death. In the present case, the evidence for an interregnum in the procuratorship is all the stronger from the repeated executions which marked the persecution that ensued on the death of Stephen.⁴⁸ Now we are able to fix the date of such an interregnum. It was in the latter part of A.D. 36 that Pilate was summoned before Vitellius, the prefect of Syria, on the complaint of the Samaritans, against whom he had perpetrated his crowning outrage. He was deposed by Vitellius, and sent to Rome for trial by the emperor; but, before his arrival, Tiberius had died, on the 16th of March A.D. 37. Pilate's departure from Judæa must, therefore, be placed just at the end of A.D. 36; and no successor arrived for a considerable time. Meanwhile, Vitellius visited Jerusalem, with Herod Antipas, at the Passover (March 19th) of A.D. 37; when he deposed Joseph Caiaphas, the creature of Pilate, from the high-priesthood. Having left the city on his return to Antioch, he received orders from Tiberius to aid Herod in his war against Aretas. Therefore, retracing his steps toward Arabia Petræa, Vitellius was again at Jerusalem at Pentecost (May 9th). On the arrival of the news of the death of Tiberius, four days after the Feast, Vitellius left Jerusalem, abandoning the cause of Herod. Here, then, was just one of those opportunities of which Jewish turbulence was ever ready to take advantage. Moreover, it was almost always at one of the great festivals that these outbreaks took place; and such a season is indicated by the presence of a large body of Hellenists at Jerusalem, just as at the great Pentecost of Acts ii., and at the Feast when Paul was seized. All this points to the Pentecost, May, A.D. 37, as the date of Stephen's martyrdom; but it would also be consistent with the general tenor of the argument to infer that the event took place either about the Passover of that year, or at the Feast of Tabernacles of A.D. 36, when Pilate's authority was tottering and he may have been ready to connive at any act of

⁴⁸ Acts xxvi. 10.

violence committed by Caiaphas and his party. On the latter supposition, the period of anarchy following the disgrace of Pilate would prolong the opportunity for the persecution conducted by Saul. At all events, these arguments, with the mutual confirmation of the dates for the martyrdom of Stephen and the conversion of Saul, which evidently followed close upon it, seem clearly to bring both events within the compass of a year, from the autumn of A.D. 36 to the autumn of A.D. 37.^{48b}

§ 10. This first triumph of the foes of Christianity gave the signal for a general persecution, into which Saul entered with the fiercest zeal, committing men and women alike to prison, scourging them in the synagogues, and trying to make them blaspheme the name of Christ, and giving his vote for the death of those on whom the Sanhedrim usurped the power of passing capital sentence. The result was a general dispersion of the disciples from Jerusalem, the Apostles, however, remaining to watch over the common welfare. This movement was the first great cause of the Gospel being carried beyond the confines of Judæa:—"They that were scattered abroad went in different directions, preaching the word."⁴⁹ We shall see presently that some of them went through Phœnicia into Syria as far as Antioch, and across to the island of Cyprus, confining their ministry at first to the Jews, but soon venturing to preach Christ to the Greeks at Antioch.⁵⁰ Meanwhile the narrative of St. Luke follows the progress of the Gospel in the Holy Land, through the three great steps of the conversion of the Samaritans, of the Ethiopian eunuch, and of the Roman centurion, both of whom were already proselytes. Thus early are the representatives of races alien to the Jews, both at home and in the regions of the east, south and west, brought into the Church, while the conversion of Saul prepares for the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles.

The daily ministrations of relief probably ceased with the dispersion of the disciples; and Philip, the worthy colleague of Stephen, went and preached Christ in the city of Samaria,⁵¹ a work which the Jewish prejudices of most of the dis-

^{48b} Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, Introd. chap. ix., and s. a. A.D. 37. The above argument is in substance that of Mr. Lewin, who adopts the date of Pentecost A.D. 37, without absolutely rejecting those of Passover A.D. 37, or Tabernacles (Sept. 24, A.D. 36).

Comp. chap. xiv. § 10: On the Chronology of Paul's Life.

⁴⁹ Acts viii. 4. ⁵⁰ Acts xi. 19, 20.

⁵¹ Acts viii. 5. The absence of the definite article leaves room for the supposition that this "city of Samaria" may have been Sychar; but is

ciples would have prevented their undertaking. How far our Lord's own ministry at Sychar (Shechem) had affected the Samaritans in general, we can hardly judge, unless perhaps from his rejection by one of their villages. But since that time, the people of the city had been entirely led away by the arts of a magician named SIMON (usually called *Simon Magus*), who seems to have given himself out and to have been received as the Messiah. But his tricks of sorcery could bear no comparison with the simple power of Philip's miracles, casting out unclean spirits, and healing the palsied and the lame. The people received his preaching of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ with joyful unanimity, and both men and women were baptized. Simon, not the only impostor of his class who has seen gain in the profession of godliness—perhaps too, with the ordinary mixture of self-deception, fancying that he might learn new arts from Philip's superior skill—Simon was himself baptized, and remained with Philip, wondering at his miracles.⁵² Meanwhile, the tidings reached Jerusalem; and Peter and John being sent by the Apostles to Samaria, conferred on the converts the gift of the Holy Ghost.⁵³ This new wonder was a fresh stimulus to Simon's lust of power and gain. He offered money to the Apostles, as the price of their giving him the same power. Peter's indignant rebuke and exhortation to repentance so far affected Simon that he asked the Apostles to pray for him, that he might escape the sentence they had denounced; but he gave no sign of genuine repentance.⁵⁴ His later history is obscured by superstitious legends, but thus much seems clear—that he continued to mix the profession of a spurious Christianity with the practice of his magical arts, and that he came to a miserable end.⁵⁵ The two Apostles did not return to Jerusalem till they had preached throughout the country of the Samaritans.⁵⁶

§ 11. Meanwhile Philip was directed by an angel to follow the road from Jerusalem to Gaza through the south-western desert. There was another traveler before him on the way, an Ethiopian eunuch, who held high office at the court of Candace, queen of the great Ethiopian monarchy which had

commonly understood of Samaria itself, the Roman Sebaste.

⁵² Acts viii. 5-13.

⁵³ Vers. 14-17. Not, however, by their own powers but by *prayer*, accompanied with the laying on of their hands.

⁵⁴ Vers. 19-24.

⁵⁵ On the later history of Simon Magus, see *Notes and Illustrations*. The memory of his peculiar guilt has been perpetuated in the word *simony*, as applied to all traffic in spiritual offices.

⁵⁶ Acts viii. 25.

long flourished to the south of Egypt with its capital at Meroë.⁵⁷ Even in that remote region, a large body of Jews had been established under the Egyptian King Psammetichus, and this Ethiopian minister had become a proselyte.⁵⁸ He had performed the long journey to worship at Jerusalem; and the great events that had occurred there may have influenced the religious meditations which occupied him as his chariot bore him leisurely toward the frontier. For he was reading aloud Isaiah's great prophecy of Christ's sufferings, and wondering what the prophet meant. At the impulse of the Spirit, Philip ran forward to overtake the chariot, and broke in with a question which led the eunuch to ask him to mount the chariot; and, as they went along, Philip preached to him Christ from the text furnished by the prophet. As he spoke, the true light shone into the mind of the pious and docile learner; and, when a pool or spring of water by the roadside suggested to him the question, "What prevents my being baptized?"—Philip complied at once.⁵⁹ The chariot is stopped. Both descend from it to the water; and both were returning to it after the act of baptism was performed, when the Spirit caught away Philip from the eyes of the eunuch, who went on his way rejoicing. How far he was instrumental in spreading the Gospel among his countrymen we know not; for our information of the planting of Christianity in Abyssinia and Sennaar (the region about Meroë) dates only from the fourth century. But his story is most memorable as a leading example of individual conversion and as a lesson not to limit God's methods of working it. Meanwhile Philip went on his mission to the cities of the Philistine plain, from Azotus (Ashdod) where he was again first seen, through all the maritime region as far as Cæsarea.⁶⁰ At that city he seems to have fixed his abode; for we find him there, eighteen or nineteen years later, receiving Paul and his companions into his house, on their final journey to Jerusalem. He was still remembered as one "of the Seven," but was also distinguished by the title of "Evangelist;" and he had four daughters endowed with prophetic gifts.⁶¹ We are not without some indication of the date of these transactions. The eunuch was of course returning from one of the three great

⁵⁷ *Candace* is a title, like Pharaoh. Dion Cass. (liv. 5) and other ancient authors mention queens of Meroë with this name.

⁵⁸ Some suppose him to be a Jew, but St. Luke calls him *ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ*.

⁵⁹ The question and answer in ver. 37 are spurious, the addition of one who could not see that the eunuch had already shown the spirit of true faith.

⁶⁰ Acts viii. 16-40.

⁶¹ Acts xxi. 8-10.

festivals, and which that was may perhaps be inferred from the fact that the Book of Isaiah furnished the lessons for the *Feast of Tabernacles*. If the force of this argument be admitted, the conversion of the eunuch will be placed after the Feast of Tabernacles in A.D. 37 or 38; according as we assign the earlier or later date to Stephen's martyrdom.

§ 12. The same city of Cæsarea, the Roman capital of Judæa, was the scene of the third great step in the spread of the Gospel within the Holy Land, the conversion of the centurion Cornelius. Besides their relative national positions, there was still another difference between the two cases:—the eunuch seems to have been a “proselyte of righteousness,” fully received into the Jewish Church by circumcision; but Cornelius and his friends were uncircumcised,⁶² and so only “proselytes of the gate.” Though their conversion did not take place till after that greater event which raised up the chosen messenger of the Gospel to the Gentiles, it is mentioned by anticipation here, in connection with that of the outcast Samaritans, and of the more favored Ethiopian proselyte.

We pause, therefore, at the point at which the preaching of the Gospel, begun from Jerusalem according to Christ's command, had embraced all classes of the Jewish name—the pure Jews and the despised Samaritans, the representatives of the Dispersion, and the circumcised proselyte from the far southern region which Christ himself had called the ends of the earth. Such were the results accomplished about the epoch marked by the death of the Emperor Tiberius (A.D. 37,) and distinguished also, as we have already seen, by the disgrace of Caiaphas and Pilate, the two chief actors in the death of Christ.

⁶² Acts x. 28, xi. 3.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

SIMON MAGUS.

THE history of Simon Magus is a remarkable one. According to Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 26) he was born at Gitton, a village of Samaria, identified with the modern *Kuryet Jit*, near *Nâbulus*. He was probably ed-

ucated at Alexandria, and there became acquainted with the eclectic tenets of the Gnostic school. Either then or subsequently he was a pupil of Dosithens, who preceded him as a teacher of Gnosticism in Samaria, and whom he supplanted with the aid of Cleobins. He is first introduced to

us in the Bible as practicing magical arts in a city of Samaria, perhaps Sychar (Acts viii. 5: comp. John iv. 5), and with such success, that he was pronounced to be "the power of God which is called great"* (Acts viii. 10). Simon's history, subsequently to his meeting with Peter, is involved in difficulties. Early Church historians depict him as the pertinacious foe of the Apostle Peter, whose movements he followed for the purpose of seeking encounters, in which he was signally defeated. In his journeys he was accompanied by a female named Helena, who had previously been a prostitute at Tyre, but who was now elevated to the position of his *ἐννοια*† or divine intelligence. His first encounter with Peter took place at Cæsarea Stratonis (according to the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*, vi. 8), whence he followed the Apostle to Rome. Eusebius makes no mention of this first encounter, but represents Simon's journey to Rome as following immediately after the interview recorded in Scripture (*H. E.* ii. 14); but his chronological statements are evidently confused; for in the very same chapter he states that the

* The A. V. omits the word *καλούμενη*, and renders the words "the great power of God." But this is to lose the whole point of the designation. The Samaritans described the angels as *δυνάμεις*, i. e., uncreated influences proceeding from God. They intended to distinguish Simon from such an order of beings by adding the words "which is called great," meaning thereby the source of all power: in other words, the Supreme Deity. Simon was recognized as the incarnation of this power. He announced himself as in a special sense "some great one" (Acts viii. 9).

† In the *ἐννοια*, as embodied in Helena's person, we recognize the dualistic element of Gnosticism, derived from the Manichean system. The Gnostics appear to have recognized the *δύναμις* and the *ἐννοια*, as the two original principles from whose junction all beings emanated. Simon and Helena were the incarnations in which these principles resided.

meeting between the two at Rome took place in the reign of Claudius, some ten years after the events in Samaria. Justin Martyr, with greater consistency, represents Simon as having visited Rome in the reign of Claudius, and omits all notice of an encounter with Peter. His success there was so great that he was deified, and a status was erected in his honor, with the inscription "Simoni Deo Sancto" (*Apol.* i. 26, 56). The above statements can be reconciled only by assuming that Simon made two expeditions to Rome, the first in the reign of Claudius, the second, in which he encountered Peter, in the reign of Nero, about the year 68: and even this takes for granted the disputed fact of St. Peter's visit to Rome. His death is associated with the meeting in question: according to Hippolytus, the earliest authority on the subject, Simon was buried alive at his own request, in the confident assurance that he would rise again on the third day (*Adv. Hær.* vi. 20). According to another account, he attempted to fly in proof of his supernatural power; in answer to the prayers of Peter, he fell and sustained a fracture of his thigh and ankle bones (*Constitut. Apostol.* ii. 14, vi. 9); overcome with vexation, he committed suicide (*Arnob. Adv. Gent.* ii. 7). Simon is generally pronounced by early writers to have been the founder of heresy. It is difficult to understand how he was guilty of heresy in the proper sense of the term, inasmuch as he was not a Christian: perhaps it refers to his attempt to combine Christianity with Gnosticism. He is also reported to have forged works professing to emanate from Christ and his disciples.



Tarsus.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL, A.D. 37-40.

- § 1. Subject of the Second Part of the Acts—Its relation to St. Paul's Epistles—Outline of St. Paul's life—His first appearance, as a persecutor—Review of his life. § 2. Saul's birthplace and parentage—His Roman citizenship. § 3. His trade of tent-making—His education in Greek learning at Tarsus, and in Rabbinical lore at Jerusalem. § 4. His rigid Pharisaism, and zeal for the law—His persecuting spirit, in its relation to the teaching of Gamaliel—Confessions of his own state of mind. § 5. His part in the martyrdom of Stephen and the ensuing persecution. § 6. The three accounts of St. Paul's conversion—(i.) The *light*, and Paul's vision of Jesus—(ii.) The *sound*, and Paul's colloquy with the Lord—The part of the by-standers in the scene—Its outward and inward aspects—(iii.) The return to Damascus, and mission of Ananias—Paul restored to sight, and baptized. § 7. His conversion an evidence of the truth of Christianity. § 8. His designation to the Apostleship—His ministry at Damascus and retreat to Arabia—His escape from Damascus to Jerusalem (his *first visit* after his conversion)—His reception by the Apostles and the Church—His relations to Peter. § 9. His vision in the Temple, and full commission to the Gentiles. § 10. The Churches of Judæa rest and prosper—Chronology of the Acts, and especially of St. Paul's life—The rest of the Churches viewed in relation to the state of Judæa under CALIGULA.

§ 1. THE last chapter opened with a remark on the mistake of viewing the "Acts" as a biographical history of the Apostles. A similar caution may be given against looking upon the latter part of the book as a biography of St. Paul. "The Apostle of the Gentiles" is the central figure, because the Conversion of the Gentiles is the main subject; and for some time the Church at Jerusalem is still kept in view. This portion of the history, however, requires to be illustrated by all that we can learn of the Apostle's life. For this the materials are to be found in a comparison of Paul's Epistles with the "Acts." Such a comparison was long since developed by Paley into a powerful confirmation of the truth of the Gospel which Paul preached.¹ More searching criticism has revealed new difficulties; but the more they are discussed, the more do they illustrate the soundness of the main argument. That argument is the more forcible from the obvious fact, that the Epistles were written without any reference to the history; nor does the canon of the New Testament indicate any attempt to combine them with it, so as to form what we should call in modern phrase the Apostle's "Life and Letters." The early traditions of the Church appear to have left almost untouched the space of time for which we possess those sacred and abundant sources of knowledge; and they aim only at supplying a few particulars in the biography beyond the points at which the narrative of the *Acts* begins and terminates.

While bearing in mind the caution against regarding the

¹ Since Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, the most important works on the subject have been *The Life and Letters of St. Paul*, by Conybeare and Howson, and the *Life of St. Paul* and the *Fasti Sacri* of Mr. Lewin. What amount of agreement and discrepancy may be observed between the *Acts* and the *Epistles* is a much disputed question. The most adverse and extreme criticism is represented by Dr. Baur of Tübingen, who finds so much opposition between what he holds to be the few authentic Pauline Epistles and the *Acts* of the Apostles, that he pronounces the history to be an interested fiction. But his criticism is the very caricature of captiousness. We have but to imagine it applied to any history and letters of acknowledged

authenticity, and we feel irresistibly how arbitrary and unhistorical it is. Putting aside this extreme view, it is not to be denied that difficulties are to be met with in reconciling completely the *Acts* and the received Epistles of St. Paul. What the solutions of such difficulties may be, whether there are any direct contradictions, how far the apparent differences may be due to the purpose of the respective writers, by what arrangement all the facts presented to us may best be dovetailed together—these are the various questions which have given so much occupation to the critics and expositors of St. Paul, and upon some of which it seems to be yet impossible to arrive at a decisive conclusion.

subsequent narrative as a biography of St. Paul, it will gain much in interest and clearness, if we first distinctly mark the following great epochs of his life:

- I. His *First appearance at Jerusalem*, as a *Persecutor*.
- II. His *Conversion* on the way to Damascus.
- III. His *Introduction to the Apostles at Jerusalem*, and retirement for a time to Tarsus.
- IV. His *Labors at Antioch*, and visit to Jerusalem in A.D. 44.
- V. His *First Missionary Journey*, in Asia Minor.
- VI. His *Visit to Jerusalem* about the Gentiles.
- VII. His *Second Missionary Journey*, and *Introduction of the Gospel into Europe*.
- VIII. His *Third Missionary Journey*, and long *Stay at Ephesus*.
- IX. His *Seizure at Jerusalem* and *Imprisonment at Cæsarea*.
- X. His *Voyage to Rome*, and *First Imprisonment*.
- XI. His *Release*, and subsequent labors.
- XII. His *Second Imprisonment*, and *Martyrdom*.

SAUL is first introduced to us in connection with the martyrdom of Stephen, and the persecution which ensued thereon. When the disciples were scattered by this persecution, Saul pursued them with a fury which Luke describes by the same image that the poets use of the monster Typhoëus, "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord;"² or, to use his own words, "Being *exceedingly mad* against them, I persecuted them even to strange cities."³ Among these cities was old Damascus, which had recently been transferred from Herod Antipas to Aretas, the King of Arabia Petræa, whose daughter Herod had put away, in order to marry his own niece and sister-in-law, Herodias. War had broken out between the two princes about their boundaries; and the Jews, who were very numerous at Damascus, espoused the cause of Aretas, and viewed Herod's defeat as a judgment for the death of John. It was therefore natural that Aretas should befriend the Jews, so as to give facilities for carrying out the jurisdiction which the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem claimed over their countrymen in foreign cities. At all events, Saul must have relied on being able to execute the commission which he sought and obtained from the high-

² Acts ix. 1.³ Acts xxvi. 11.

priests to the synagogues at Damascus, to bring all the disciples he could find there, men or women, bound, to Jerusalem.⁴ About the same time that Philip was plodding alone on the desert way from Jerusalem to Gaza, the fiery young Pharisee was riding with his retinue in the opposite direction through the Syrian desert.⁵ The unexpected crisis which hung over him invites us to cast back a glance upon his former life.

§ 2. "I verily am a Jew, born in Tarsus, of Cilicia (a citizen of no mean city), but brought up in this city (Jerusalem) at the feet of Gamaliel,"⁶ "circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as to the law a Pharisee:"⁷—such are Paul's descriptions of himself, to which the traditions of the Fathers scarcely add any trustworthy information.

We see that he belonged to a Jewish family of "the Dispersion," but of the purest Hebrew blood, and preserving the record of its descent from the tribe which had already given a king to Israel in the person of another SAUL, for such was the Jewish name that he derived from his parents.⁸ He was a "freeborn" citizen of Rome, inheriting from his father those privileges which he so often claimed in a spirit that serves as a pattern of the value that Christians should set upon their political rights. It is a common error to suppose that Saul's father enjoyed the Roman citizenship simply as an inhabitant of Tarsus. It is true that the capital of the province of Cilicia, placed on the banks of the Cydnus, in the narrow fertile plain between the Mediterranean and the snowy peaks of Taurus, at the conflux of the commerce between Asia Minor and the East, well deserved the epithet applied to it by its most distinguished son: it was "no mean city;" but yet it neither ranked as a *municipium* nor a *colonia*; and its position as a "free city" (*libera civitas*) did not entitle its sons to the Roman franchise. It is conjectured, therefore, that

⁴ Acts ix. 1, 2. The understanding between the Jews of Damascus and the Arabian governor is seen in the measures which they afterward concerted against St. Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 32.

⁵ We may take it for granted, with the artists, that the journey was performed on horseback, though the sacred narrative is silent on the point.

⁶ Acts xxii. 3, xxi. 39.

⁷ Philipp. iii. 5. His father also was a Pharisee, Acts xxiii. 6.

⁸ The story mentioned by Jerome, that St. Paul's parents lived at Gischala in Galilee, and that, having been born there, the infant Saul emigrated with his parents to Tarsus upon the taking of that city by the Romans, is inconsistent with the fact that Gischala was not taken until a much later time, and with the Apostle's own statement that he was born at Tarsus (Acts xxii. 3).

this privilege had been conferred upon Saul's father as the reward of services rendered during the civil wars; and we have many other examples of the enjoyment of the franchise by Jews.⁹

§ 3. The traveler observes at the present day the plain of Tarsus dotted over with the black tents of goat's-hair, under which the people live while gathering in their harvest. Cilicia was famed of old for the manufacture of this goat's-hair cloth, which was called *Cilicium*; and Saul was brought up to the occupation of a tent-maker.¹⁰ The excellent custom of the Jews to teach every youth some trade, whether he had to earn his living by it or not, afterward enabled the Apostle—when such independence was of vital consequence to his ministerial success—to labor with his own hands, and so to make the Gospel without charge to the disciples.¹¹ It by no means follows that the family were in a necessitous condition; and the contrary may be inferred from the liberal education which St. Paul received. To that acquisition of the Greek language, which the situation and commercial activity of Tarsus made almost a matter of course, he added such an acquaintance with Hellenic literature, as not only to quote freely from Greek poets,¹² but to prove himself familiar with the very spirit of Hellenism.¹³ These accomplishments, together with the influence which the general atmosphere of a highly-cultivated Greek community must have had upon his susceptible nature, formed in no small degree his peculiar qualifications for the special part to which he was called in the diffusion of Christianity, as the "Apostle of the Gentiles."

§ 4. But, though Hellenistic, his family were not Hellenizing. A "Hebrew of the Hebrews," he was early sent to Jerusalem, to be "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the most perfect manner of the law of the fathers."¹⁴ Here he added to that perfect familiarity with the Septuagint,

⁹The names of *Junia* and *Lucius*, which occur among those of his kindred (Rom. xvi.), seem to furnish evidence of his Roman connections; and his own name of *Paulus*, which is commonly assumed to have been adopted upon the conversion of Sergius Paulus, may have been derived much earlier from his Roman citizenship. The Greek names which occur in the same list mark the Greek connections of the Hellenistic Jew. (See

Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. ch. ii.)

¹⁰*σκηνοποιός*, Acts xviii. 3.

¹¹Acts xx. 34; 1 Cor. iv. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 9, xii. 13, 14; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8.

¹²Acts xviii. 28; Tit. i. 2.

¹³Especially in the opening of the Epistle to the Romans, and in many passages of those to the Corinthians.

¹⁴Acts xxii. 3, where the word *ἀνατεθραμμένος* implies that he re-

which as an Hellenist he had been taught from his childhood, a complete knowledge of Hebrew and of the Hebrew Scriptures,¹⁶ as well as the whole mass of the traditional lore of the Pharisaic school. The profound learning which lies at the basis of all the reasonings of his Epistles confirms his own account of the rapid progress which he made in the Jews' religion above many of his contemporaries.¹⁶ But Saul was no mere intellectual student. The young Pharisee had already acquired among "his own people" a reputation for sanctity of life and strict observance of all the traditions of the sect, which he more than maintained at Jerusalem. He could afterward confidently appeal to the knowledge of all the Jews, that "after the most straitest sect of their religion he lived a Pharisee;"¹⁷ nay, he could boast with a good conscience, that he was blameless as touching the righteousness *which is in the law.*¹⁸ Paul was no converted profligate; and thus far he is an example of that course of divine grace which visits with new light and life the cultivated intellect and the well-regulated character. But those qualifying words point to the greater virtues which he did not possess; and his frequent ironical allusions to "glorying," "boasting," and "pleasing men," confess the stigma which Christ had stamped upon the Pharisees, who "received honor one of another," and "loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." His own sorrowful confession marks his highest reputation among the Jews as a state of "ignorance and unbelief" — ignorance of the true meaning of the Scriptures in which he was so proficient, and unbelief in their spiritual sense.¹⁹ But his darkness was not that of the cold night of scepticism. The same enthusiastic temperament which afterward bore him on through the many "perils"²⁰ of his apostolic course, broke out in youth as a fierce zeal for the traditions of the fathers.²¹

When Paul afterward came forward as the great opponent of the false interpretation of the law, it was at least impossible to charge him with ignorance or indifference upon the

ceived his education chiefly at Jerusalem. The phrase "at the feet of Gamaliel" is not merely a figure, for the Rabbis occupied an elevated seat, or daïs, among their pupils. Mr. Lewin, who supposes Saul to have gone to Jerusalem about the age of 11 (about A.D. 19), suggests that the removal of the family may have been the result of the troubles that arose in

Cilicia about the affair of Piso and the death of Germanicus.

¹⁶ Acts xxi. 40, xxii. 2.

¹⁶ Gal. i. 14.

¹⁷ Acts xxvi. 4, 5; following the reading ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου ἐν τε ἱεροσολύμοις.

¹⁸ Phil. iii. 5.

¹⁹ 1 Tim. i. 13.

²⁰ 2 Cor. xi. 26.

²¹ Gal. i. 14; Acts xxii. 3; Phil. iii. 6, etc.

subject. He had no doubt completed his course of study at the feet of Gamaliel, and perhaps returned to Jerusalem after an absence of some time at Tarsus, when the first preaching of the Apostles, and the disputations of the deacons presented a special object of attack.²² And here it is most interesting to contrast the solitary appearance of Gamaliel in the Acts with the course chosen by St. Paul; the master's counsels of toleration with the persecuting zeal so soon displayed by the pupil. There is room for the supposition that the advice which Gamaliel gave, as an opponent of the Sadducees, concerning the treatment of believers in a resurrection, may have been greatly modified when he found the Christians arguing against the Pharisaic traditions. But, be this as it may, the teaching of the Pharisaic doctor, which regarded the students of the law as the "holy people," and declared that "this people who knoweth not the law are cursed,"²³ did but produce its natural fruit in the ardent spirit of Saul, with his youthful impatience of all compromise. How far his zeal was inflamed by that bitterest element, which is supplied by conscious doubts and struggles, is a question as difficult as it is interesting. From Nicodemus to Gamaliel, we may trace among the Pharisees the working of that conviction of the truth of Christ's Messiahship, which was the appropriate fruit of their learning and their doctrines. Jesus constantly deals with them as being willfully blind; and St. Paul's celebrated confession of his own ignorance and unbelief is at least capable of the like interpretation. The very word *unbelief*, in such a connection, implies the consideration of the great question which Gamaliel had propounded in the Sanhedrim, and which could hardly have escaped discussion in his school. We can not doubt, therefore, that it was as the result of doubtful struggles, if not of suppressed conviction, that Saul came to "think verily with himself that he ought to do many things against the name of Jesus of Nazareth."²⁴ Such a state of mind will account for the fury which he shared with the other Hellenists who were refuted by Stephen; and the deep sense of it breathes through his

²² Whether Paul was at Jerusalem at the time of our Saviour's ministry and crucifixion is a question best left in the silence of Scripture concerning it; but we can hardly conceive that he would never have alluded to such experience. His question, "Have not I seen Jesus Christ our Lord?"

manifestly refers to some supernatural vision of Christ, probably his "appearance in the way" to Damascus. (Comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8 with Acts ix. 3, 17, xviii. 9, xxii. 14, 18, xxiii. 11.)

²³ John vii. 49.

²⁴ Acts xxvi. 9.

remorseful allusions to that darkest day of his whole career.²⁶ Let those who maintain that zeal is a virtue, even in a bad cause, ponder Paul's confession that he was the chief of sinners because he was "a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious," and therefore the most signal example of God's long-suffering;²⁷ that he was "the least of the apostles, and not worthy to be called an apostle, *because he persecuted the Church of God.*"²⁸

§ 5. In the martyrdom of Stephen we must not think of Saul as a mere by-stander. The mention of "them of Cilicia" seems to assign him a place among the disputants against Stephen;²⁹ but his part in the murder, only second to that of the witnesses whose clothes he took charge of, is marked by the emphatic statement "Saul was consenting to his death."³⁰ The angelic glory that shone from Stephen's face, and the divine truth of his words, failing to subdue the spirit of religious hatred now burning in Saul's breast, must have embittered and aggravated its rage. He became not simply the chief instrument, but the prime mover, in the great persecution for which that deed gave the signal; and it was by his activity that the Christians were forced to flee from Jerusalem. "As for Saul, he made havoc of the Church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison."³¹ His own confession amplifies the historian's account, and tells us of the eager malice with which, probably as a member of the Sanhedrim, he voted for their death, or helped to inflict minor punishments, such as scourging in the synagogue, and tried, greatest triumph of all to the persecutor's spite, to compel them to blaspheme the name of Christ.³² The Pharisees and Sadducees now evidently sank their difference in common hatred against the Christians; and the absence of a Roman procurator enabled them to usurp the power of life and death. Saul might almost have been for the time the governor of Jerusalem. The chief priests might have been content with the apparent expulsion of the Christians from Jerusalem; but not so Saul,—"*Being exceedingly mad against them, I persecuted them even unto foreign cities.*"³³ It was by his own seeking that he obtained

²⁶ Acts xxii. 20. ²⁸ 1 Tim. i. 13-16.

²⁷ 1 Cor. xv. 9. ²⁹ Acts vi. 9.

²⁸ Acts vii. 58, viii. 1.

³⁰ Acts viii. 3.

³¹ Acts xxii. 19, xxvi. 10, 11. The English version implies that even thus early there were found rene-

gades who blasphemed the name of Christ, as indeed Peter had done already. But the proper force of the Greek imperfect, *ἠνέκαζον*, signifies that the efforts of the persecutors failed.

³² Acts xxvi. 11.

the letters of the high-priest to the synagogues of Damascus, to enable him to seize and bring bound to Jerusalem any "of the way," whether men or women."

§ 6. But the Divine Ruler had prescribed a very different issue, and Saul was arrested on his journey by a miracle which converted the persecutor of his Jewish brethren into the Apostle of the Gentiles. This event is related in detail three times in the Acts, first by the historian in his own person, then in the two addresses made by St. Paul at Jerusalem and before Agrippa.²⁴ These three narratives are not repetitions of one another: there are differences between them which some critics choose to consider irreconcilable. Considering that the same author is responsible for all the accounts, it seems pretty clear that the author himself could not have been conscious of any contradictions in the narratives. He can scarcely have had any motive for placing side by side inconsistent reports of St. Paul's conversion; and that he should have admitted inconsistencies on such a matter through mere carelessness, is hardly credible. Strange that those who are so proud of detecting "obvious discrepancies," can not see that they are too obvious to have escaped the notice of the writer, whose leaving them as they stand is a decisive proof of honesty! In the one place he gives in his own language a simple account of the most essential features of the transaction, viewed merely as an historical event:—the sudden light from heaven; the voice of Jesus speaking with authority to his persecutor; Saul struck to the ground, blinded, overcome; the three days' suspense; the coming of Ananias as a messenger of the Lord; and Saul's baptism.²⁵ In the other two passages, he reports speeches which St. Paul made before different auditors, bringing forward in each case those points which were best fitted to convince the hearers; points relating chiefly to his own consciousness, but in no one respect inconsistent with those recorded in the simpler narrative. It is to be especially observed that St. Luke, in telling the plain story of Paul's conversion, refers to what the by-standers witnessed as a sort of supplement; while St. Paul himself, in using the event as an evidence of his divine mission, lays more stress on their experience, and weaves it step by step into his account. As a critical example of unity in diversity,

²⁴ Acts ix. 2. Respecting this appellation for the Christians, comp. Acts xix. 9, 23. ²⁵ Acts ix., xxii., xxvi.

²⁶ It is now proved by all the best

MSS. that the phrase in Acts ix. 5, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," is an interpolation from Acts xxvi. 14.

and for its importance as one of the chief evidences of the truth of Christianity, each step of the narrative must be compared in the three accounts.

(i.) Saul and his company had nearly completed the journey³⁶ across the vast level east of the Lake of Tiberias—"the Desert of Damascus"—bounded only by the chain of Lebanon faintly seen on the far horizon:—"the earth in its length and breadth, and all the deep universe of sky, is steeped in light and heat;" and the towers of the most ancient city in the world are now in full sight, when the brightness of the noonday sun³⁷ is suddenly swallowed up in a greater light from heaven, which seems to envelop the little band. The fancy that this might have been a subjective vision to the internal sense of Saul alone is precluded by his own statement in the third of the accounts—"shining round about me, *and them that journeyed with me.*"³⁸ The light then was a real effulgence visible to all, and all were stricken to the earth by its sudden overpowering splendor.³⁹ But Saul, though alone struck blind by the light, alone beheld the vision of the Son of God amid the light, as he appeared to the Three Children in the fiery furnace, and to Stephen in the article of death, and afterward to John in Patmos—visible only to his *spiritual* sense. This view, though not undisputed, is amply justified, first by the contrast in the narrative itself—for the attendants, who retained their natural vision, *saw no man*—and next by the express declarations of Ananias—"The Lord Jesus, *who appeared unto thee in the way*"⁴⁰—"The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, *that thou shouldest . . . see that Just One*"⁴¹—and by those by Paul himself—"Have not I *seen Jesus Christ our Lord?*"⁴²—"Last of all *he was seen of me also*, as of one born out of due time."⁴³ The last passage seems decisive, concluding as it does the list of the visible appearances of

³⁶ The traditional scene of St. Paul's conversion is at *Kaukaba* (the *place of the star*), six miles S.W. of Damascus, on the road from Jerusalem.

³⁷ The time of the day is mentioned in both of Paul's speeches, but not in Acts ix.

³⁸ Acts xxvi. 13: and in Acts xxii. 9 it is said that they "saw indeed the light."

³⁹ Acts xxvi. 14. Besides the trivial nature of the objection founded on the words in Acts ix. 7, "The

men which journeyed with him *stood speechless*"—where there is evidently no emphasis on the *attitude*—it should be observed that these words are not parallel to the others in the order of the narrative, but come *after* the conversation, during which, while Paul was still prostrate in trance upon the earth, the rest would naturally have time to recover their feet, and would as naturally "stand speechless" watching for their leader's recovery.

⁴⁰ Acts ix. 17. ⁴¹ Acts xxii. 14.

⁴² 1 Cor. ix. 1. ⁴³ 1 Cor. xv. 8.

Christ to his Apostles after his resurrection, by this to the last-chosen of their number.

(ii.) The light was attended by the *sound* so familiar to Jewish belief as the "Bath-Col," or voice from heaven, audible to the attendants probably much in the same way as to the Jews on the occasion when some said it thundered.⁴⁴ But what they heard as a mere *sound* was to Saul the distinct *voice* of Him who appeared to him in the light, a remonstrance which at once revealed Himself and claimed the obedience of one well known to Him—"Saul! Saul! why persecutest thou me?" The fuller narrative in St. Paul's defense before Agrippa adds that striking figure, which is not only a warning of the folly of resistance, but implies that *conscious effort against conviction* of which we have before spoken—"It is hard for thee to kick against the goad."⁴⁵ Amid the vague astonishment of the answer, we trace the acknowledgment of the appeal from heaven, "Who art thou, LORD?"—while the reply fully reveals him whom Saul was henceforth to serve with as much zeal as that with which he now opposed him: "I am JESUS of Nazareth, *whom thou persecutest*."⁴⁶ To the trembling and astonishment caused by his being "apprehended"—to use his own figure—in the very act described by his earthly master as "fighting against God," was at once added that entire change of heart and spirit and purpose toward Christ, which has caused the transaction to be called ever since, "the *Conversion* of St. Paul." He had much yet to learn; but this great change was marked, and the key-note of his future life was struck by the humble inquiry, "Lord! what wilt thou have me to do?" The answer was left to be given by the appointed hu-

⁴⁴ The trivial suggestion of a discrepancy between Acts ix. 7 and xxii. 9, which could hardly have been entertained for a moment by any who reflected on the double meaning of the Greek *φωνή* for sounds both articulate and inarticulate, is decisively answered by the explanatory words in the latter passage, "they heard not the voice *of him that spake to me*." (Comp. 1 Cor. xiv. 7-11, where the argument is obscured by the double rendering of *φωνή* by *sound* and *voice*, the latter word often bearing in English the same double sense.)

⁴⁵ Acts xxvi. 14. The image, which is taken from a restive ox kicking against the driver's goad, and thereby only punishing himself the more, was

doubtless proverbial. At least we find it used 500 years before by Æschylus (*Prom. Des.* 322):

οὐκ οὖν ἐμοίγε χρώμενος διδασκάλῳ
πρὸς κέντρα κῶλον ἐκτενεῖς.

The vaguer sense suggested to the English reader by the word *pricks* is curiously embodied in a medal struck on the defeat of the Spanish Armada, showing the pope, cardinals, and Catholic powers seated round a pit, full of stakes, on the sharp points of which their bare feet are playing, with the legend, "*Durum est contra stimulos calcitrare*."

⁴⁶ The epithet *Ναζωραῖος* occurs only in Paul's defense to the Jews, Acts xxii. 8.

man agency, after an interval of preparation ; and the supernatural scene was closed by the command to Saul to rise up," and go into Damascus to wait for his commission. And here we have the most interesting example of that unity in diversity which marks the three accounts. The narrative of St. Luke of course mentions the return to Damascus, and so forth, in the historic order; and in St. Paul's defense to the Jews, importance is naturally assigned to the miraculous and prophetic ministry of Ananias, while the commission to the Gentiles—so sure to rouse their indignation—was as naturally deferred to the last.⁴⁷ But, in addressing Agrippa, he passes over the transactions at Damascus, in which the king would take no interest, to come at once to the essential matter of his commission, by which he hoped to persuade him to become a Christian. In so doing he ascribes to Jesus, not only the message afterward brought to him by Ananias, but the revelation made to him at a later period in the Temple, in words which were those of Christ himself. With perfect truthfulness to the spirit of the transaction, he condenses into one point of view revelations which really formed but one. What Saul actually heard from Jesus, on the way as he journeyed, was afterward interpreted into that definite form in which he repeated it to Agrippa.

In all that passed, from the moment when all fell to the earth at the outburst of the light from heaven till Saul again rose to his feet, his companions had no other part than that of silent wonder. "They stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man."⁴⁸ As they could not distinguish the articulate voice that conversed with Paul, so neither did they hear articulate words proceeding from his lips. It seems therefore that he heard and spoke by means of an inward spiritual sense.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ The words, "and stand upon thy feet," which occur only in Acts xxvi. 16, indicate that Saul remained prostrate during the whole conversation.

⁴⁸ Acts xxii.

⁴⁹ Acts ix. 7.

⁵⁰ The instantaneous vision of Jesus in the flash of light that blinded him was followed by that apprehension of His presence which would go with a real conversation. *How* it was that Saul "saw" and "heard" we are quite unable to determine. That the light and the sound, or voice, were both different from any ordinary phenomena with which Saul and his

companions were familiar, is unquestionably implied in the narrative. It is also implied that they were specially significant to Saul, and not to those with him. We gather, therefore, that the rewere real outward phenomena, through which Saul was made inwardly sensible of a Presence revealed to him alone.

Externally there was a flash of light. Spiritually, "the light of the gospel of the glory of the Christ, who is the image of God," shone upon Saul, and convicted the darkness of the heart which had shut out Love

(iii.) Saul rose from the ground, and opened his eyes after his trance, only to find that "he could not see for the glory of that light."⁵¹ The guidance by which his comrades led him into Damascus was the type of his new spiritual state, "taken by the hand" by his Lord. In the street called Straight, he became the guest of Judas, perhaps one of the chief of the disciples whom he came to persecute. Of the communion with his new-found Master during his three days of darkness and fasting, we have only the simple record, "Behold he prayeth!"—which shows him in the fit attitude for receiving the mission of Ananias, a vision of whose coming had consoled his waiting.⁵² The messenger sent to him was a convert of his own class, "a devout man according to the law," and one so familiar with all the evil that Paul had done, as to be at first incredulous of his conversion. He salutes Saul

and knew not the glory of the Cross. Externally Saul fell to the ground. Spiritually he was prostrated by shame, when he knew whom he had been persecuting. Externally sounds issued out of heaven. Spiritually the Crucified said to Saul, with tender remonstrance, "I am Jesus, why persecutest thou me?" Whether audibly to his companions, or audibly to the Lord Jesus only, Saul confessed himself in the spirit the servant of Him whose name he had hated. He gave himself up, without being able to see his way, to the disposal of Him whom he now knew to have vindicated His claim over him by the very sacrifice which formerly he had despised. The Pharisee was converted, once for all, into a disciple of Jesus the Crucified.

The only mention in the Epistles of St. Paul of the outward phenomena attending his conversion is that in 1 Cor. xv. 8, "Last of all he was seen of me also." But there is one important passage in which he speaks distinctly of his conversion itself. Dr. Baur, with his readiness to find out discrepancies, insists that this passage represents quite a different process from that recorded in the Acts. It is manifestly not a repetition of what we have been reading and considering, but it is in the most perfect harmony with it. In the Epistle to the

Galatians (i. 15, 16) St. Paul has these words: "When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen . . . (*ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί*)." What words could express more exactly than these the spiritual experience which occurred to Saul on the way to Damascus? The manifestation of Jesus as the Son of God is clearly the main point in the narrative. This manifestation was brought about through a removal of the veils of prejudice and ignorance which blinded the eyes of Saul to a Crucified Deliverer, conquering through sacrifice. And, whatever part the senses may have played in the transaction, the essence of it in any case must have been Saul's inward vision of a spiritual Lord close to his spirit, from whom he could not escape, whose every command he was henceforth to obey in the spirit. All this is summed up in the brief sentence in which Paul relates his conversion to the Galatians: "When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen" (Gal. i. 15, 16).

⁵¹ Acts ix. 8, xxii. 11.

⁵² Acts ix. 11, 12.

as a brother, and, in the name of that same Lord Jesus who had appeared to him by the way, bids him receive his sight. The scales, which seemed at once to fall from his eyes, were those which had blinded his spiritual even more than his natural vision;⁶³ and his own narrative adds the full account of the revelation that burst upon him:—"The same hour I looked up upon him, and he said, The Lord God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see the Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard."⁶⁴ Every word in this address strikes some chord which we hear sounded again and again in St. Paul's Epistles. The new convert is not—as is commonly said—converted from Judaism to Christianity: *the God of the Jewish fathers chooses him*. He is chosen to *know God's will*. That will is manifested in *the Righteous One*. Him Saul *sees and hears*, in order that he may be *a witness of him* to all men. The eternal will of the God of Abraham; that will revealed in a Righteous Son of God; the testimony concerning him, a Gospel to mankind:—these are the essentially Pauline principles which are declared in all the teaching of the Apostle, and illustrated in all his actions. The mission of Ananias was completed by the baptism of Saul; and not till he had washed away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord, did he break his three days' fast, and was strengthened.⁶⁵

§ 7. That the bigoted persecutor, at the climax of honor with his own nation, and in the full career of success, should have suddenly cast in his lot with the Christians, and entered on the new course of self-sacrificing labor and suffering which made up the rest of his life, has often been esteemed of itself a complete evidence of the truth of Christianity. The argument, which is fully set forth in Lord Lyttelton's *Letter on the Conversion of St. Paul*, is thus summed up by Paley:—"Here then we have a man of liberal attainments, and in other points of sound judgment, who addicted his life to the service of the Gospel. We see him, in the prosecution of his purpose, traveling from country to country, enduring every extremity of danger, assaulted by the populace, punished by the magistrates, scourged, beat, stoned, left for dead; expecting, wherever he came, a renewal of the same treatment and the same dangers; yet, when driven from one city, preaching in

⁶³ Acts ix. 19; comp. John ix. 39-41.

⁶⁴ Acts xxii. 13-15.

⁶⁵ Acts ix. 18, xxii. 16. The nar-

rative in the defense to the Jews ends at this point, and proceeds to his visit to Jerusalem.

the next; spending his whole time in the employment, sacrificing to it his pleasures, his ease, his safety; persisting in this course to old age, unaltered by the experience of perverseness, ingratitude, prejudice, desertion; unsubdued by anxiety, want, labor, persecutions; unwearied by long confinement, undismayed by the prospect of death. Such was Paul. We have his letters in our hands; we have also a history purporting to be written by one of his fellow-travelers, and appearing, by a comparison with these letters, certainly to have been written by some person well acquainted with the transactions of his life. From the letters, as well as from the history, we gather not only the account which we have stated of *him*, but that he was one out of many who acted and suffered in the same manner; and that of those who did so, several had been the companions of Christ's ministry, the ocular witnesses, or pretending to be such, of his miracles and of his resurrection. We moreover find this same person referring in his letters to his supernatural conversion, the particulars and accompanying circumstances of which are related in the history; and which accompanying circumstances, if all or any of them be true, render it impossible to have been a delusion. We also find him positively, and in appropriate terms, asserting that he himself worked miracles, strictly and properly so called, in support of the mission which he executed; the history, meanwhile, recording various passages of his ministry which come up to the extent of his assertion. The question is, whether falsehood was ever attested by evidence like this. Falsehoods, we know, have found their way into reports, into tradition, into books; but is an example to be met with of a man voluntarily undertaking a life of want and pain, of incessant fatigue, of continual peril; submitting to the loss of his home and country, to stripes and stoning, to tedious imprisonment, and the constant expectation of a violent death, for the sake of carrying about a story of what was false, and what, if false, he must have known to be so?"

§ 8. The divine message conveyed by Ananias to the new convert clearly involved a designation to the Apostleship, as the sight of Jesus by the way and the words addressed to Saul proved his choice to the office and supplied its chief external qualification. The public exercise of his office began immediately after his baptism. Received into full fellowship with the Christians of Damascus, he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God; and the more they wondered at the great persecutor's conversion, as contrasted with the fell purpose which brought him to the city, the more

he increased in strength, "and confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is very Christ."⁵⁶ The narrative of St. Luke does not stay to relate how the news was received at Jerusalem; but the disappointed rage of Saul's former friends is proved in his subsequent history. From himself too we learn that he made the choice deliberately, not to go first to Jerusalem and seek confirmation or advice from those who were Apostles before him; but, instead of thus "conferring with flesh and blood," he acted on the conviction that "it had pleased God, who separated him from his mother's womb, and called him by his grace, to reveal his Son in him, that he might preach him among the heathen."⁵⁷

Of the time thus spent, before Saul was driven from Damascus,⁵⁸ we learn further particulars from himself.⁵⁹ He defines the "many days" of Luke as three years; which may mean either three full years or one year with parts of two others. Near the beginning (as it would seem) of this period, he retired into Arabia; we are not told to what district, or for what purpose—perhaps for seclusion, meditation and prayer, in opposition to "conferring with flesh and blood"—and then he returned to Damascus. Here a conspiracy was formed against him by the Jews, who lay in wait to kill him, while the ethnarch under Aretas, the Arabian king, kept watch with the garrison to prevent his escape. But the Eastern fashion of building houses upon walls enabled Paul to escape by the same device used by Rahab at Jericho.⁶⁰ Being let down through a window by the wall in a basket, he took his course to Jerusalem.⁶¹ The motive of this visit,

⁵⁶ Acts ix. 19-22.

⁵⁷ Gal. i. 15, 16. ⁵⁸ Acts ix. 23.

⁵⁹ Gal. i. 17, 18. ⁶⁰ Josh. ii. 15.

⁶¹ Acts ix. 23-25, 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33.

Certain localities in Damascus are shown as the sites of those Scriptural events which especially interest us in its history. A "long wide thoroughfare"—leading direct from one of the gates to the castle or palace of the Pasha—is "called by the guides 'Straight'" (Acts ix. 11); but the natives know it among themselves as "the Street of Bazaars" (Stanley, p. 412). The house of Judas is shown, but it is not in the street "Straight" (Pococke, ii. 119). That of Ananias is also pointed out. The scene of the conversion is confidently said to be "an open green spot, surrounded by

trees," and used as the Christian burial-ground; but this spot is on the eastern side of the city, whereas St. Paul must have approached from the south or west. Again it appears to be certain that "four distinct spots have been pointed out at different times" (Stanley, p. 412) as the place where the "great light suddenly shined from heaven" (Acts ix. 3); so that little confidence can be placed in any of them. The point of the walls at which St. Paul was let down by a basket (Acts ix. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 38) is also shown; and, as this locality is free from objection, it may be accepted, if we think that the tradition, which has been so faithless or so uncertain in other cases, has any value here.

as he himself tells us, was to form Peter's acquaintance, or "to enquire of Peter,"⁶² whom in the time of persecution he had doubtless learned to regard as the chief of the Apostles. He probably thought that the time was come for that concert with the former Apostles, which he had purposely abstained from seeking as a preliminary qualification for his own ministry. And even now he takes pains to have it understood that he accepted no formal confirmation of his call from the "apostolic college." He mentions the journey as an illustration of his argument that he did not receive the Gospel which he preached (that is, the commission to preach it) from man;⁶³ and adds the solemn asseveration—"before God, I lie not"—to the statement, "Other of the Apostles saw I none save James the Lord's brother."⁶⁴ The great body of the disciples viewed the re-appearance of their former persecutor with distrust, and refused to believe that he was a disciple, till Barnabas—who, as a Cypriot, seems to have had relations with the Hellenist Jews of Tarsus⁶⁵—brought Saul to the Apostles, and told them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and how boldly he had preached Christ at Damascus. With equal boldness Saul now began to dispute with the Hellenists; and he was only saved from Stephen's fate through being hastily escorted by the brethren to Cæsa-rea, whence he sailed for Tarsus.⁶⁶

§ 9. He had spent only fifteen days at Jerusalem, as the guest of Peter;⁶⁷ and it becomes a question of deep interest, whether this intercourse of theirs took place before or after the time when Peter had opened the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles by the conversion of Cornelius; and how far they aided in opening one another's eyes to the mystery of the conversion of the whole world.⁶⁸ For we are so accustomed to think of Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles, as to forget that his Jewish prejudices were naturally as strong as those

⁶² *ιστορήσαι Πέτρον*, Gal. i. 18.

⁶³ Gal. i. 11, 12.

⁶⁴ Gal. i. 19, 20. No critic, in dealing with any book but the Bible, would fail to see that the principle of interpreting a general statement by a specific one removes all shadow of discrepancy between this passage and that in Acts ix. 27, where it is said that Barnabas introduced Saul to the Apostles.

⁶⁵ Cyprus is within a few hours' sail of Cilicia.

⁶⁶ Acts ix. 26-30.

⁶⁷ Gal. i. 18. It is the natural, though not necessary, interpretation that the 15 days with Peter measure his whole stay at Jerusalem.

⁶⁸ The emphasis which St. Paul lays on his private and cautious communication to the principal Apostles of the Gospel which he had preached to the Gentiles, on his subsequent visit to Jerusalem 14 years later, seems opposed to such a theory (Gal. ii. 2).

of Peter. Saul had indeed already been designated, in the revelation to Ananias, as "a chosen vessel unto God, to bear his name before the *Gentiles*, and kings, and the children of Israel;"⁶⁹ but we do not know that Ananias had given him the commission more distinctly than in the general phrase "to all men,"⁷⁰ and Saul had as yet preached only in the Jewish synagogues at Damascus. The visit to Jerusalem was the season appointed for him to receive his full commission to the *Gentiles*, the particulars of which he relates in his defense before the Jews.⁷¹ As he was praying in the Temple, he fell into a trance, and for the second time beheld a vision of the Lord, who bade him to make haste and depart from Jerusalem, "for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me." His argument in reply, from their former knowledge of him as a persecutor, was answered by the repetition of the command, "Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the *Gentiles*." The revelation is evidently made to Saul alone, and that as a novelty and mystery inconsistent with the supposition that the Church at Jerusalem had already acknowledged the conversion of Cornelius and his *Gentile* friends. It seems to include not only a designation to his particular department of apostolic work—so offensive to the Jews—but also a distinct recognition of that independence of his apostolic calling which might have provoked jealousy even among his Christian brethren. And, just as the bare recital of those words roused Saul's infuriated audience to cry, "Away with such a fellow from the earth!" so would the consciousness of such a mission probably hurry him away out of the reach both of Jews and Judaizing Christians, without his venturing to communicate it even to Peter. The view most consistent, both with the sequence of the narrative and with the order in which the Gospel message was developed, seems to be that each Apostle was led on independently, and without concert, to his separate mission to the *Gentiles*; the one to open to them the door of the kingdom of heaven, the other to go abroad and compel them to come in. Nor had the Christians of Judæa any but the slightest knowledge of Saul till, after his flight from Jerusalem, he "came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia; and they heard only, that he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed; and they glorified God in him."⁷²

⁶⁹ Acts ix. 15.⁷⁰ Acts xxii. 15.⁷¹ Acts xxii, 17-21.⁷² Gal. i. 21-24.

§ 10. The narrative in the *Acts* distinctly places after this visit to Jerusalem that season of outward quiet which forms a grateful interval in the history of the early Church:—"Then had the churches rest throughout all Judæa, and Galilee, and Samaria, and were edified, and, walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, were multiplied."⁷³ To appreciate this statement fully, we must here endeavor to supply that want of a distinct chronology which is so much felt in the *Acts of the Apostles*. The amount of industry and learning, recently brought to the discussion by Dr. Howson and Mr. Lewin, has reduced the controversy within very narrow limits; and the comparative table on page 424 will at once show the points of difference between these leading authorities, and also how satisfactory is their general agreement, though arrived at by different trains of argument, concerning the leading epochs of Paul's life.

It will be observed that the main points of difference—exclusive of the date of Paul's birth, and the period after his first imprisonment at Rome, which are confessedly very uncertain—are the following:

(1.) The *First Missionary Journey* is placed three years earlier, and the *Visit to Jerusalem to the Council* two years earlier by Mr. Lewin than by Dr. Howson.

(2.) This discrepancy is balanced by the greater extent which Mr. Lewin gives to the *Second Circuit*.

(3.) The fourth visit to Jerusalem is placed by Mr. Lewin at the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 53, by Dr. Howson at Pentecost, A.D. 54.

(4.) The difference respecting the visit of Gal. ii. rests on a different computation of the 3 years and 14 years of Gal. i. 18, and Gal. ii. 1.

There are but two events in the life of Paul which give us sure marks of time. The one is his journey from Antioch to Jerusalem with Barnabas, on the occasion of the great famine under Claudius, about the time of the death of Herod Agrippa I.—an event which we can fix with certainty to A.D. 44; and the visit itself could not be later than A.D. 45.⁷⁴ The

⁷³ Acts ix. 31.

⁷⁴ Acts xi. 12. Hence this visit could not be identical with that which Paul mentions (Gal. ii. 1) as having been made 14 years after his first visit, or his conversion. For even if the interval be reduced to the minimum according to the Jewish reck-

oning, the first visit would fall at least as early as A.D. 33, and the conversion (on the same mode of reckoning) at least as early as A.D. 31. For other independent proofs that the two visits were different, see Conybeare and Howson, Appendix on Chronology of Gal. ii.

other date is that of the judgment of St. Paul by Festus; who can be proved, almost with certainty, to have succeeded Felix as procurator of Judæa in A.D. 60—in the autumn of which year, therefore, Paul was sent as a prisoner from Cæsarea to Rome.⁷⁶ From the latter date we can safely reckon back, through his two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea,⁷⁸ to the Pentecost of A.D. 58, as the date of his last arrival at Jerusalem.⁷⁷

On his way thither, he had sailed from Philippi to Troas after the Passover,⁷⁸ after residing at Corinth for three months, that is, in the winter and early spring of A.D. 57 to 58.⁷⁹ Thence we trace him back through Macedonia to Ephesus; a leisurely journey, for, as he went over those parts, he gave them much exhortation.⁸⁰ It was therefore before the middle of A.D. 57 that he was driven by the great tumult from Ephesus, after he had labored in the city for three years;⁸¹ and this is confirmed by the known date of the Artemisia, the festival at which the riot occurred, which was in May. Again we meet the difficulty as to the mode of reckoning; but, as Paul had gone over the whole country of Phrygia and Galatia, strengthening all the disciples,⁸² before he came to Ephesus, we can hardly date the beginning of this his *Third Missionary Journey* later than the autumn of A.D. 54. Mr. Lewin places it at the beginning of the year.

Here again we have an element of uncertainty in the "some time" which he had previously spent at Antioch after the conclusion of his second missionary journey.⁸³ But the time of the year when he reached Antioch is marked approximately by the hasty visit which he first paid to Jerusalem at the "Feast."⁸⁴ It is usually assumed that this Feast, which Paul was so anxious to keep at Jerusalem, was the Pentecost, in which case the "some days" spent at Antioch after it would bring us back to the Pentecost, A.D. 54; for the abrupt transition in St. Luke's narrative, and the incessant activity of St. Paul's labors among the Gentiles, now stimulated by the desire to make his collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem, alike forbid us to suppose that the interval was long. But

⁷⁶ Wieseler, *Chron. Syn.* pp. 66, foll.; Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. app. ii.

⁷⁸ Acts xxiv. 27.

⁷⁷ Acts xxi. 15: comp. xx. 16. As a striking confirmation of this date, Mr. Lewin points out that the Sunday on which Paul preached at Troas (Acts xx. 7) was the 13th day after

the Passover, which feast therefore ended on a *Monday*, a circumstance which did not occur for many years before or after A.D. 58.

⁷⁹ Acts xx. 6.

⁷⁹ Acts xx. 3.

⁸⁰ Acts xx. 2.

⁸¹ Acts xx. 31

⁸² Acts xviii. 23.

⁸³ Acts xviii. 23.

⁸⁴ Acts xviii. 21, 22.

Mr. Lewin prefers a still earlier date, and regards "the Feast" as the Feast of Tabernacles of A.D. 53 (September 16th), supposing that the Apostle wintered at Antioch, and commenced his Third Circuit at the very beginning of A.D. 54. Thus the two computations agree within six months as to the conclusion of Paul's *Second and greatest Missionary Journey*, of which the last year and a half was spent at Corinth," bringing us back to A.D. 52, and leaving us to account for the wide range of travel, with all its important incidents, from Antioch through Cilicia, Lycaonia, Galatia, Troas, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, and Athens—quite enough to fill up not only the other part of A.D. 52, and the whole of A.D. 51," as Dr. Howson supposes, but to bring us back to the earlier date of Mr. Lewin (A.D. 49). For the date of St. Paul's eighteen months' residence at Corinth, during this circuit, we have independent evidence in the edict of Claudius banishing the Jews from Rome, whereby Aquila and Priscilla were driven to Corinth, and in the time of Gallio's proconsulship of Achaia. The reader is referred to Mr. Lewin's *Fasti Sacri* for the argument which deduces from these data the result, that Paul arrived at Corinth about Feb. A.D. 52, and left that city about August A.D. 53, just in time to reach Jerusalem by the Feast of Tabernacles.

Before this second journey we have another interval of "some days" spent by Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, after their return from their important visit to Jerusalem to consult the Apostles and elders concerning the liberties of the Gentile converts.⁶⁵ The foregoing calculations lead us to place the date of this epoch, alike in the Apostle's history and in that of the whole Church—the so-called Council of Jerusalem—either in A.D. 50, or A.D. 48.

At this point we encounter one of the greatest difficulties. Dr. Howson finds in the date of A.D. 50 another starting-point, from which to reckon back to the epoch of St. Paul's conversion. For of the five visits which are distinctly mentioned in the *Acts*⁶⁶ as "having been paid by St. Paul to Jerusalem," this, he contends, is the only one that can answer to that

⁶⁵ Acts xviii. 11.

⁶⁶ Acts xv. 36–xviii.

⁶⁷ Acts xv. 35, 36.

⁶⁸ Namely, the *first* after his conversion, Acts ix.; the *second*, with Barnabas, after the death of Herod Agrippa I., Acts xi. xii.; the *third* at the "Council," Acts xv.; the

fourth at the conclusion of his second missionary journey, Acts xviii.; and the *fifth* when he was seized by the Jews, Acts xxi. For the arguments that the *third* of these was that mentioned in Gal. ii., see Conybeare and Howson's note to chap. v., vol. ii., pp. 244, foll.

mentioned in *Gal. ii. 1*, as having occurred "*fourteen years after*" the events recorded in *Gal. i.* The reckoning may be made either from Paul's conversion, or from his ensuing (first) visit to Jerusalem; and, on the other hand, the fourteen years, on the Jewish computation, may have been little more than twelve. Taking the average between these two doubts, we may reckon back the fourteen years from A.D. 50 to A.D. 36 or 37, and take this as the most probable epoch of St. Paul's conversion.⁹⁹ It is most interesting to observe how Mr. Lewin arrives at almost the same result from a very different point of departure. He maintains, for reasons which will be better understood at the proper place in the narrative, but the conclusiveness of which is very doubtful, that the visit of Galatians ii. refers to Paul's arrival at Jerusalem at the close of his Second Circuit, which he places at the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 53. He contends further that the "3 years" of *Gal. i. 18*, and the "14 years" of *Gal. ii. 1*, are to be computed more definitely than is commonly supposed; for that, while the phrase used in the former case (*μετὰ ἔτη τρία*) may mean *the third year current*, the different form of expression in the latter (*διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἔτων*) signifies *an interval of fourteen years complete*; and that this fourteen years must be computed, not from Paul's conversion, but from the previous visit mentioned in Galatians i. 18. Upon these data, reckoning back 14 *years complete* from the Feast of Tabernacles of A.D. 53, we arrive at the Feast of Tabernacles of A.D. 39, for Paul's first visit to Jerusalem, to see Peter. Thence reckoning back to *the third year current*, we obtain some date in the interval between the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 36, and the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 37, as the epoch of St. Paul's conversion.

⁹⁹ On the Jewish mode of reckoning, so constantly referred to in this discussion, the following remarks are of great importance:—"It must not be imagined that the Jews arbitrarily called *the same interval* of time 14, 13, or 12 years; but the denomination of the interval depended on the time when it began and ended, as follows. If it began on September 1st, A.D. 38, and ended October 1st, A.D. 50, it would be called 14 years, though really only 12 years and 1 month; because it began before the 1st of Tisri, and ended after the first of Tisri; and as the Jewish civil year began on the 1st of Tisri, the inter-

val was contained in 14 *different civil years*. On the other hand, if it began on October 1st, A.D. 38, and ended September 1st, A.D. 50, it would only be called 12 years, although really only two months less than the former interval which was called 14 years. Hence, as we do not know the month of the flight from Damascus, nor of the Council of Jerusalem, we are at liberty to suppose that the interval between them was only a few weeks more than 12 years; and therefore to suppose the flight in A.D. 38, and the Council in A.D. 50." (Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii., app. ii. note B.)

But more than this: it seems manifest that the conversion must be placed not long after the martyrdom of Stephen, and yet at a sufficient interval to leave time for the intervening persecution. Now we have been led by independent reasoning to fix the martyrdom of Stephen either at the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 36, or at the Passover or Pentecost of A.D. 37, which would lead us to the summer of A.D. 37 for the conversion. Finally we have the allusion to Saul as "a young man" (*νεανίας*)⁸⁰ at the death of Stephen, which must be compared with his description of himself as "Paul the Elder" at the time when he wrote to Philemon from his prison at Rome (A.D. 62)⁸¹ Now we happen to have a distinct definition by Philo, the contemporary of St. Paul, of the limits of age which the Jews denoted by these phrases; according to which Paul might be about 28 in A.D. 37, and about 53 in A.D. 62, so that his birth may be placed approximately in A.D. 9. We are aided in fixing the lower limit by the fact that Aretas was not in possession of Damascus till A.D. 37.

The conclusion, that Paul's conversion took place about the beginning, and his flight from Jerusalem about the middle of Caligula's reign of four years (A.D. 37-41), is in perfect agreement with the occurrence of that interval of rest to all the churches which is mentioned as immediately succeeding his departure from Jerusalem to Tarsus. This interval of rest may be ascribed, not only to the cessation of Saul's persecution, but to the relations of Judæa to the empire under Caligula. It has already been told how that Cæsar's insane attempt to set up his own statue in the sanctuary drove the Jews to the verge of a rebellion, which was only averted by his death;⁸² and we can well believe that the agitation of the whole people at the impending danger would divert their attention from the Christians. Thus the commotions which have shaken the world and divided the Church's enemies against themselves, have often given her a shelter and a breathing-space, just as she seemed about to succumb to persecution.

⁸⁰ Acts vii. 58.

⁸¹ Philem. 9. Παῦλος πρεσβύτερος, where "Paul the aged" is apt to give an exaggerated idea of age, and would rather correspond to γέρων.

The following is Philo's division of the periods of human life, by sevens:

1. Child (παιδίον) up to 7 years.
2. Boy (παῖς) " 14 "

3. Youth (μειράκιον) up to 21 years.

4. Young man (νεανίσκος) 28 "

5. Man (άνήρ) " 49 "

6. Elder (πρεσβύτερος) " 56 "

7. Old man (γέρον) above 56 "

(Philo, *de Mund. Opif.* 36, quoted by Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, A.D. 9, No. 1035).

Dr. Howson places St. Paul's birth about A.D. 5 or 6. ⁸² Chap. v. § 6.

| CONYBEARE AND
HOWSON. | LEWIN. | TABLE OF ST. PAUL'S LIFE. |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| A.D.
About 5 or 6 | A.D.
About 11 | Birth of Saul at Tarsus. |
| 86 | 36 or 37 | Martyrdom of St. Stephen. |
| 87 | 37 | Conversion of St. Paul. |
| 89 | 39 | His <i>first visit</i> to Jerusalem. |
| | (Feast of Tabernacles.) | |
| 39-40 | 39-40 | Rest of the Jewish Churches. |
| 40 | 40 | Conversion of Cornelius. |
| 44 | 43 | Barnabas fetches Saul from Tarsus to Antioch. |
| 44 | 44 | Famine; and death of Herod Agrippa I. |
| 44 or 45 | 44 | Barnabas and Saul go to Jerusalem with the collection. (Paul's <i>second visit</i> .) |
| 48-49 | 45-46 | Paul's <i>First Missionary Journey</i> . |
| 50 | 48 | Paul and Barnabas go up to the Council at Jerusalem. |
| | | Paul's <i>third visit</i> .* |
| 51 | 49 | Paul's <i>Second Missionary Journey</i> . |
| 52 | 52 | Paul arrives at Corinth, where he stays 18 months. |
| | (February.) | Paul arrives at Jerusalem. |
| 54 | 53 | His <i>fourth visit</i> .† |
| (Pentecost.) | (Tabernacles.) | Winters at Antioch (Lewin). |
| | | Paul's <i>Third Missionary Journey</i> . |
| 54 | 54 | |
| (Latter half.) | (Beginning.) | He reaches Ephesus, where he stays 3 <i>full years</i> (Lewin). |
| 55 | 54 | |
| | (May.) | |
| 55-57 | 54-57 | Leaves Ephesus for Macedonia. |
| 57 | 57 | |
| | (About Pentecost.) | |
| 57-58 | 57-58 | Winters at Corinth (3 months). |
| 58 | 58 | Reaches Philippi at the <i>Passover</i> . |
| | (March 27.) | |
| 59 | 59 | Reaches Jerusalem at Pentecost. |
| | (May 17.) | Paul's <i>fifth visit</i> , and arrest in the Temple. |
| 59-60 | 58-60 | Imprisonment at Cesarea. |
| 60 | 60 | Festus succeeds Felix. |
| | (About Midsummer.) | |
| 60 | 60 | Paul sails for Rome. |
| | (End of August.) | |
| | About Nov. 1 | His shipwreck at Malta. |
| 61 | 61 | Paul reaches Rome. |
| | (Beginning of March.) | |
| 63 | 61-63 | His first imprisonment (two years). |
| | 63 | On his release Paul |
| | (Spring.) | goes to Macedonia sails for Jerusalem, |
| | | and Asia Minor and visits Antioch, |
| | | (C. & H.) Colossæ and Ephesus. |
| 64-66 | 64 | (Lewin.) Paul, after visiting Crete, leaves |
| (In Spain?) | | Ephesus for Macedonia. |
| 67-8 | 64-5 | Winters at Nicopolis. |
| | 65 | (Lewin.) Visits Dalmatia, and returns |
| | | through Macedonia and Troas to Ephesus, |
| | | where he is arrested and sent to Rome. |
| 69 | 66 | Martyrdom of St. Paul at Rome. |
| (May or June.) | (June 29.) | |

* Dr. Howson identifies this visit with that of *Galatians ii.*, and places the collision with Peter at Antioch after it.

† Mr. Lewin identifies this visit with that of *Galatians ii.*, and places the collision with Peter at Antioch after it.



Antioch.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GENTILES RECEIVED INTO THE CHURCH.

FROM AFTER THE CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL TO THE DECREE OF THE FIRST COUNCIL AT JERUSALEM, INCLUDING THE FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY OF PAUL AND BARNABAS. A.D. 40—A.D. 48 OR 50.

- § 1. St. Peter at Lydda and Joppa—Healing of *Æneas* and raising of *Dorcas*. § 2. Mission of St. Peter to *Cornelius*—The first Gentile converts—Nature of this transaction—It is confirmed at Jerusalem. § 3. The Gospel preached to the Greeks at Antioch—Mission of Barnabas—He seeks out Saul at Tarsus. § 4. Accession of *CLAUDIUS—HEROD AGRIPPA I.*, King of Judæa—He beheads *JAMES* and imprisons Peter, who is delivered by an angel—Death of Herod Agrippa I. § 5. Paul's ministry in Syria and Cilicia—Barnabas and Saul at Antioch—The name of *CHRISTIAN*—Mission of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem (his second visit). § 6. Paul's rapture and infirmity. § 7. The Church at Antioch—Separation of Barnabas and Saul for the mission to the Gentiles. § 8. Their **FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY**—From Antioch by Seleucia to Salamis in Cyprus—They preach in the Jewish Synagogues—Through Cyprus to Paphos—Judgment on the sorcerer *Elymas*, and conversion of the proconsul *Sergius Paulus*. § 9. The

name of PAUL. § 10. The voyage from Cyprus to Perga in Pamphylia—The passage of the Taurus—Description of John Mark—His subsequent relations to Paul and Peter—Apostleship of Barnabas. § 11. The Apostles at Antioch in Pisidia—Paul's discourse in the synagogue—*Justification by Faith in Christ* no merely Pauline doctrine. § 12. The following Sabbath—Opposition of the Jews—"Lo! we turn to the Gentiles"—The Apostles driven from Antioch. § 13. Success and persecution at Iconium—Lycaonia—The miracle and discourse at Lystra—Derbe. § 14. Return of the Apostles. § 15. Ordination of ELDERS. § 16. Judaizing teachers come to Antioch and require the Gentile converts to observe the Law—Mission of Paul and Barnabas, with others, to Jerusalem. § 17. This (third) visit probably that of Galatians ii.—Paul goes up by revelation—Conferences and compact with the other Apostles, James, Peter and John. § 18. Public discussion in the Church—Speech of Peter—Report of Paul and Barnabas—Advice of James. § 19. Decision of the Assembly—Its significance: the emancipation both of Jews and Gentiles, and the universality of the Gospel. § 20. Episode of Paul's subsequent reproof of Peter—The Assembly at Jerusalem wrongly called the First Council—Return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, with Judas and Silas—Silas remains at Antioch—Christianity at Rome.

§ 1. It was in the interval of rest described in the preceding chapter, which we may place in the latter part of Caligula's reign, that Peter made what appears to have been an Apostolical visitation of all the churches already established.¹ Arriving at Lydda, in the great maritime plain of Sharon,² he performed a miracle of healing on a certain Æneas, who had been bedridden with palsy for eight years. Imitating the manner of his Master in the command, "Arise, and make thy bed," he was careful to show the source of the power which accompanied his words by saying, "*Jesus Christ maketh thee whole.*" The miracle was followed by the general conversion of the inhabitants of the city of Lydda and the plain of Sharon.³

Nine miles from Lydda, and on the sea-shore, stands Joppa, the ancient port of Solomon. Here dwelt a disciple, whose

¹ Acts ix. 32: διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων sc. ἐκκλησιῶν.

² This name, the Hebrew *Lod* is still retained by the modern *Lidd* or *Lüdd*, which probably occupies the same site. It stands in a part of the great maritime plain which anciently bore the name of Sharon. It is 9 miles from Joppa, and is the first town on the northernmost of the two roads between that place and Jerusalem. The water-course outside the town is said still to bear the name

of *Abi-Butrus* (Peter), in memory of the Apostle. It is, for a Mahometan place, busy and prosperous. Buried in palms, and with a large well close to the entrance, it looks from a distance inviting enough, but its interior is very repulsive on account of the extraordinary number of persons, old and young, whom one encounters at every step, either totally blind, or afflicted with loathsome diseases of the eyes.

³ Acts ix. 32-35.

name—TABITHA in Aramaic, in Greek DORCAS, that is, *gazelle*—generally associated in the East with the perfection of female beauty—has become the type of the greater loveliness of that charity with which she clothed the poor by the labor of her own hands. Her death was felt so grievous a loss by the brethren at Joppa, that they sent messengers to Lydda, praying for a visit from St. Peter. His arrival was followed by the crowning miracle which proved that the spiritual gifts conferred by Christ upon his Apostles did not stop short of power over life and death. And in this case also, Peter proceeded after the example given by our Saviour in raising the daughter of Jairus.⁴ Putting forth from the chamber, where the corpse was already laid out for burial, the mourners whose lamentations and display of the garments she had made proved at once the reality of her death and the sense of their loss, Peter knelt down and prayed. Then, turning to the body, he said, “Tabitha, arise!” “And she opened her eyes: and when she saw Peter, she sat up. And he gave her his hand, and lifted her up, and when he had called the saints and widows, he presented her alive.” The news spread through Joppa; many believed on the Lord; and Peter took up his abode for a long time among the converts, in the house of his namesake, Simon a tanner, on the sea-shore.⁵

§ 2. Here it was the Apostle’s custom to ascend at noon to the house-top, which looked over the western waters, for solitary prayer; unconsciously blending his devotions with those which a Roman soldier at Cæsarea was continually offering, that new light might be added to what he had learned as a “proselyte of the gate.” This soldier was Cornelius, a centurion of the Italian Cohort, “a just man, and one that feared God, with all his house, and of good report among all the Jewish nation, who gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway.” To this man’s devotion, and faithfulness to the light he had, was vouchsafed a vision of an angel, bidding him to send to Joppa for Simon Peter, who should tell him what he ought to do. It was no phantasm of a nocturnal dream, but an open vision, manifest to his waking sense, at three o’clock in the afternoon, as he was praying in his house at the hour of the evening sacrifice.

⁴ Matt. ix. 25; Mark v. 40-42.

⁵ Acts ix. 36-43.

⁶ This seems to have been a cohort of Italians, probably volunteers, separate from the legionaries. Such a cohort is mentioned in an inscrip-

tion:—“Cohors militum Italicorum voluntaria, quæ est in Syria.” See Conybeare and Howson’s *St. Paul*, vol. i. p. 143, ed. of 1865; Lewin’s *Fast. Sac. s. a. 40*.

His messengers were already approaching Joppa on the following day, when Peter also, in his midday retirement upon the house-top, was visited in a trance by a vision which taught him, through emblems specially adapted to his prejudices as a Jew, the hardest lesson for a Jew to learn, "that he should not call any man common or unclean," and which was interpreted by the words, thrice repeated from heaven—"What *God hath cleansed*, that call not thou common!" The lesson was at once enforced by the arrival of the messengers of Cornelius and the command of the Spirit to go with them; and the journey of a day and a half from Joppa to Cæsarea gave Peter time to reflect upon this meaning. So, when he found Cornelius waiting with his kinsmen and near friends, to hear the divine message from his mouth, he was prepared to declare the great principle of the new dispensation:—"Of a truth I perceive that *God is no respecter of persons*; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Then to these GENTILES he preached the Gospel of the life and death of Christ, his resurrection and coming again to judgment, and the remission of sins through his name to all who believe in him. While Peter was in the act of speaking, the believing reception of his words by Cornelius and his friends was divinely ratified by the immediate effusion of the Holy Spirit, repeating for these representatives of the Gentiles the gift bestowed on the Jews at Pentecost, and conferring the power of speaking with tongues. The sign was needed to remove the doubts, if not of the Apostle himself, of the Judaizing Christians who accompanied him; for the existence of that party is already indicated in the narrative by the phrase, "they of the circumcision."⁷ While they were silent with astonishment, Peter decided all doubt concerning the full reception of these new converts into the Church by the argument, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, *which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*" He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord, and stayed some days among them.⁸

This event was the crown and consummation of Peter's ministry. He, who had first preached the resurrection to the Jews, baptized the first converts, and confirmed the Samaritans, now, without the advice or co-operation of any of his colleagues, under direct communication from heaven, first

⁷ Acts x. 45, xi. 2.

⁸ Acts x. It is well worthy of notice that Peter does not baptize them himself.

threw down the barrier which separated proselytes of the gate from Israelites; first established principles which issued in the complete fusion of the Hebrew and Gentile elements in the Church. The narrative of this event, which stands alone in minute circumstantiality of incidents and accumulation of supernatural agency, is twice recorded by St. Luke. The chief points to be recorded are, first, the peculiar fitness of Cornelius, both as a representative of Roman force and nationality, and a devout and liberal worshiper, to be a recipient of such privileges; and secondly, the state of the Apostle's own mind. Whatever may have been his hopes or fears touching the heathen, the idea had certainly not yet crossed him that they could become Christians without first becoming Jews. As a loyal and believing Hebrew, he could not contemplate the removal of Gentile disqualifications, without a distinct assurance that those enactments of the Law which concerned them were abrogated by a divine legislator. The vision could not therefore have been the product of a subjective impression: it was strictly objective, presented to his mind by an external influence. Yet the will of the Apostle was not controlled, it was simply enlightened. The intimation in the state of trance did not at once overcome his reluctance. It was not until his consciousness was fully restored, and he had well considered the meaning of the vision, that he learned that the distinction of cleanness and uncleanness in outward things belonged to a temporary dispensation. It was no mere acquiescence in a positive command, but the development of a spirit full of generous impulses, which found utterance in the words spoken by Peter on that occasion, both in presence of Cornelius and afterward at Jerusalem.

But the Church at Jerusalem were slow to learn the lesson involved in the tidings that the Gentiles had also received the Word of God. When Peter returned to Jerusalem, he was accused by "those of the circumcision" because he had eaten with the uncircumcised. But his plain narrative of the whole transaction, crowned by the argument that, in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, he had recognized that same baptism of the Spirit which Christ had promised as the sign of his presence with the Apostles themselves, silenced every objection, and opened every mouth in praise to God for the great revelation which marks this epoch in the history of the Church:—*"Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."* Thus had the preaching of the Word, which the Apostles had begun, according to their Lord's command, from Jerusalem, reached every class within the limits of Judæa; the

Jew and the Samaritan; the proselyte from the distant south, and the Gentiles from Rome herself; while the Great Apostle of the Gentiles had received his divine commission, which he was already beginning to exercise in Syria and Cilicia.

§ 3. Nor was this all, for Jerusalem was surprised by the tidings that the Gospel had reached the Greek capital of the East. In fact, in the history of the diffusion of Christianity, ANTIOCH⁹ occupies a place even more conspicuous than Jerusalem itself. There the first Gentile Church was formed; there the name of *Christian* was first heard; and thence the Gospel was first diffused over the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire and carried over into Europe. Its geographical position, its political and commercial importance, and the presence of a large and powerful Jewish element in its population, were the more obvious characteristics which made it fit for such a centre of Gentile Christianity. The great wave of Gospel diffusion, which had its centre in the blow struck at Stephen and the Christians at Jerusalem, passed over the northern frontier of Palestine, along the Phœnician coast, across to Cyprus, and into Syria as far as Antioch. But, while the dispersed Christians preached the Gospel everywhere, it was at first only to the Jews. But certain of the Hellenists among them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, soon grew bolder; and, on their arrival at Antioch, they spake to the Greeks, preaching the Lord Jesus. "And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord."¹⁰ It is probable that these Greeks were in the same religious position as Cornelius—proselytes of the gate—and their conversion was so nearly simultaneous with his, that when the news reached Jerusalem it found the Church prepared to act on the lesson taught through Peter. Barnabas—who, as at once a Levite and a native of Cyprus, as well as by the powers of gentle persuasion that gained him his surname,¹¹ was a chief link between the Hebrews and the

⁹ Antioch, founded in B.C. 300 by Seleucus Nicator, and named in honor of his father, Antiochus, was the capital of the Greek kings of Syria, and afterward the residence of the Roman governors of the province which bore the same name. It was situated where the chain of Lebanon, running northward, and the chain of Taurus, running eastward, are brought to an abrupt meeting. Here the Orontes breaks through the mountains; and Antioch was placed at a bend of the river, partly on an island, partly on the level which forms the left bank, and partly on the steep and craggy ascent of Mount Silpius, which rose abruptly on the south.

¹⁰ Acts xi. 19, 20. The reading "Ελληνας is now fully accepted in place of "Ελληνιστάς.

¹¹ Acts iv. 36: υἱὸς παρακλήσεως, son of exhortation, rather than of con-

Hellenists—besides having the higher qualifications so emphatically recorded by St. Luke: “He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith”—Barnabas was sent to Antioch. The lesson that had been given to Peter needed not repetition in his case. It was enough for him to see “the grace of God,” to exhort the new converts to cleave to the Lord with all their heart. His labors were more and more successful; “much people was added unto the Lord.” Barnabas saw in this movement at Antioch the beginning of a great work among the Greeks; and, intent upon finding a fit associate in the new labors before him, he departed to Tarsus to seek Saul, whom he had formerly introduced to the Apostles.¹²

§ 4. Meanwhile the state of rest enjoyed by the Churches of Judæa had come to an end. Upon the assassination of Caligula, the prætorian cohorts of Rome had raised CLAUDIUS to the purple; and one of the new emperor’s first acts was to reward the services of HEROD AGRIPPA I. with the kingdom of Judæa¹³ (A.D. 41). We have already described that policy of conciliation to the Jews, which led Herod to begin the first regal persecution of the Christians by the beheading of the first Apostolic martyr, JAMES, the brother of John, and to follow up the stroke by the imprisonment of Peter. It was during the Passover, probably in the last year of Herod’s short reign¹⁴ (A.D. 44), that he placed Peter under the strictest guard, intending to gratify the people by his death as soon as the feast was over. The night before the day fixed for the execution had arrived; and Peter, long since prepared by Christ’s prediction for the death which now seemed appointed for the very season of his Master’s passion, was sleeping soundly between two soldiers, bound by two chains, when a sudden light filled his cell; an angel roused him from his sleep, and led him through guards and through doors that opened of their own accord into the street. The angel had departed before Peter recovered from the impression that all was a vision. He repaired to the house of Mary, the mother of JOHN MARK, where many disciples were assembled in prayer. Alarmed at first by his knocking at the door, on that night of special danger, they could scarcely be convinced by

solation. Comp. the *παρεκάλει* of Acts xi. 23.

¹² Acts xi. 22-26.

¹³ See chap. v. § 7.

¹⁴ This seems clear from the sequence of the narrative in Acts xii.

We can easily understand that Herod had been hitherto fully occupied with his measures for consolidating his power and improving Jerusalem. The Passover fell this year on April 1st.

the sound of his own voice, but thought that it was his angel. Admitted at length, Peter told them the manner of his deliverance, and, having sent a special message to James,¹⁵ and the other brethren, departed into some safe retreat. In the morning, the prison was found in full security and order, but with the prisoner gone. The king took vengeance on the guards, and then departed for Cæsarea, to keep that festival at which he himself became the signal mark of God's vengeance.¹⁶

§ 5. From the position of this narrative in the *Acts*, between the mission of Paul and Barnabas by the Church of Antioch and their return, they would naturally seem to have been witnesses of the persecution; but it is doubtful whether their visit took place before the death of Herod. We must look back to the events that led Paul to pay this his second visit to Jerusalem after his conversion. The interval of uncertain length, which he spent in Cilicia and Syria, after his flight from Jerusalem to Tarsus, is a blank in the story of the *Acts*; but some commentators refer to this period the chief part at least of the perils and sufferings which he recounts to the Corinthians, including two Roman and five Jewish scourgings, and three shipwrecks.¹⁷ At all events, we may safely regard this as the great probationary period of the Apostle's ministry, in which, laboring alone and unaided by man, he was specially prepared for the wide field to which he was called when Barnabas came to Tarsus to seek his aid for the work at Antioch. The two devoted brethren labored for a whole year in the Church at Antioch, "teaching much people," till the adherents of the new faith grew to such importance as to be enrolled among the schools of religious and philosophic opinion recognized by the Greeks and Romans. *The disciples were called CHRISTIANS first at Antioch*; ¹⁸ and they soon

¹⁵ This is the first direct evidence (confirmed by Gal. i. 19) that "James the Less" already occupied a sort of presidency over the Church of Jerusalem.

¹⁶ Acts xii.: comp. chap. v. § 7. Mr. Lewin places the death of Herod about May.

¹⁷ 2 Cor. xi. 23, foll. Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. pp. 129-133, ii. p. 140. In the *Acts* we have only mention of the third Roman scourging (v. 25) at Philippi, and the stoning (v. 25) at Lystra.

¹⁸ After the discussions respecting

this name (a full account of which will be found in Conybeare and Howson), all that requires to be said is that its form (a Latin adjective in *-anus*) shows it to have been invented by the Gentiles as the appellation of a sect, like *Pompeiani*, etc. It was soon adopted by the Christians, who had before called themselves *disciples*, *brethren*, *saints*, *those of the way*, and by similar appellations, which are frequent in the New Testament, while the Jews called them *Nazarenes*. Besides the passage before us, the name Christian is used only twice in the

gave the first great example of a beneficence peculiarly Christian.

It can not but be regarded as a special act of Divine Providence, that knit together in "the fellowship of giving and receiving" the two branches of the Church, which had thus grown up among the Jews and Greeks, and which might have been tempted into a rivalry foreshadowing the worldly conflicts of the "Patriarchs" of Jerusalem and Antioch. Certain prophets went down from Jerusalem to Antioch, one of whom, named Agabus—who afterward warned Paul of his imprisonment¹⁹—foretold through the Spirit the approach of a great famine. The fulfillment of the prediction is placed in the *Acts* "in the days of Claudius Cæsar;"²⁰ but Josephus mentions a great famine which afflicted Judæa when Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander were procurators of Judæa. Now Fadus was the first procurator sent out when Judæa was again brought under the Roman government after the death of Herod Agrippa I. It would of course be at the beginning of the famine that the Christians of Antioch, forewarned by the prophet, sent relief to the brethren in Judæa by the hands of Barnabas and Saul,²¹ whose visit to Jerusalem may therefore be placed in A.D. 45. A confirmatory indication of the date is obtained from their taking back with them John Mark, the nephew of Barnabas, who may have been specially exposed to persecution on account of the assembly of the brethren in his mother's house.²² Nothing more is recorded of this visit in the *Acts*; and it deserves special notice that, if its time be rightly fixed, the recent flight of Peter from Jerusalem would prevent any intercourse on this occasion between him and Paul.²³

N. T., once by Agrippa (*Acts* xxvi. 28), and once by Peter (1 Pet. iv. 16).

¹⁹ *Acts* xxi. 10. The same person must be meant in both places; for not only the name, but the prophetic office and the residence ("of Judæa") are the same in both instances.

²⁰ *Acts* xi. 27, 28. A difficulty is suggested by the statement "that there should be great dearth throughout all the world." But this was literally true of the reign of Claudius; for, though historians give no account of any universal famine in his reign, they speak of repeated and severe local famines in various countries of the empire. Moreover, a Jewish

writer might use the phrase *ἡ οἰκουμένη* for the whole land of Palestine. In the particular famine recorded by Josephus, some relief was given to the Jews by Helena, Queen of Adiabene, a proselyte, who was then at Jerusalem, and who imported corn from Egypt and Cyprus (*Joseph. Ant.* xx. 2, § 6; 5, § 2).

²¹ *Acts* xi. 29, 30.

²² *Acts* xii. 25: comp. ver. 12.

²³ This is one argument against its being the visit mentioned in Gal. ii. 1. Mr. Lewin, however, argues that, as we have evidence that the famine began in *Italy* as early as A.D. 42 or even 41, the first year of Claudius,

§ 6. But we learn from Paul's own testimony that there was not wanting to him, on this occasion also, one of those supernatural visits which appear to have marked each one of his sojournings at Jerusalem, and which indicate the care of his Divine Master to renew the grace given to him at first, and to keep up his sensitive spirit to the pitch of his mighty work. That marvelous rapture (probably, like his former vision, in the Temple)—in which, whether in or out of the body he could not tell, he was caught up into the third heaven, and heard words which no man might utter—is stated in his *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, the date of which is fixed to A.D. 57, to have occurred "*about fourteen years ago*," a phrase which justifies our computing by *years current*, and so brings us to A.D. 44 or 45.²⁴ And this view is most admirably suited to the revelation which was thus made to the Apostle on the eve of his departure for his first missionary tour among the Gentiles. For then it was that he was about especially to encounter those "infirmities, reproaches, necessities, persecutions, distresses for Christ's sake," in which he most gladly gloried rather than in the honor of the revelation itself. Then it was that he was taught, as a needful sequel to the revelation, the great lesson of Christian humility and confidence—"My grace is sufficient for thee; for *my strength is made perfect in weakness*." But even Paul's self-sacrificing spirit needed to be taught this lesson by the discipline, not of suffering only, but of a humiliating affliction; and, like Job, he was given over to the great enemy, to worry though not to devour, within the compass of his tether. "Lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me *a thorn (or rather, stake) in the flesh, the messenger of Satan*, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." That this was some permanent infirmity (*οκόλοψ*), which troubled and hindered the Apostle through his subsequent career, seems plain from his expression

before whose accession the prophecy of Agabus was evidently given, it might have been felt in Judæa before the time named by Josephus as that of its severest pressure. He therefore places the visit of Paul and Barnabas just before the Passover of A.D. 44, and supposes them to have been at Jerusalem at the time of Peter's arrest and deliverance.

²⁴ 2 Cor. xii. The erroneous date of A.D. 60, assigned to the Epistle in

the margin of the A.V., has led to the fantastic idea that the vision was seen by St. Paul in a trance, while he lay apparently dead from his stoning at Lystra, a supposition which is also negatived by his own words, "Whether *in the body*, or out of the body I can not tell: God knoweth;" for the bruised *body* round which the disciples stood watching, was certainly not at that time "caught up into heaven" (Acts xiv. 19, 20).

of resignation to it, after his thrice-repeated prayer for its removal had been answered only by an encouragement to submission. Nor need we hesitate to draw from the general course of God's providence the conclusion that it was either, like physical infirmities in general, a relic of some past sin, or that, like Jacob's lameness, it was a memorial of some great incident in his history. Connecting it with the statement that "his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible," in striking contrast to his weighty letters," some suppose it to have been an impediment in his speech, which would be peculiarly distressing, nay, injurious, to such a man engaged in such a work—a judicial infliction on that tongue which had blasphemed Christ and condemned the first Christian martyr. A more ingenious conjecture regards the affliction as an infirmity of eye-sight, varying from time to time in severity, the relic of the blindness with which Paul was smitten on his way to Damascus, and the perpetual memorial, as in the case of Jacob, of a conflict with God, from which no man could come forth unscathed. It can scarcely be doubted that the affliction was the same as that "infirmity of the flesh," from which Paul suffered in his first visit to the Galatians, who, instead of despising him for it, were ready *to have plucked out their own eyes and have given them to him.*" But after all, it is best to believe that in this, as in other cases, the silence of Scripture is intentional; to the end that men of natures more ardent than their strength, whose spirit is willing, but whose flesh is weak, may learn from Paul's example to acknowledge and bow beneath the hand of God in those impediments, but for which they would become boasters; nay, to rejoice, that the glory of what they can yet do is not their own but God's.

²³ 2 Cor. x. 10. This view seems difficult to reconcile with that manifest power, which has caused even unbelievers to testify that "Paul was a great orator." A man with an impediment in his speech would hardly have been taken for Mercury even by the rude Lycaonians; nor would he have made so powerful an impression upon Felix and Festus and Agrippa. In fact, the objection of the polished Corinthians seems rather to refer to Paul's rhetoric than his elocution, to his language rather than his utterance,—that "great plainness," or even "rudeness of speech," as he presently calls it (2 Cor. xi. 6 :

comp. iii. 12, vii. 4, and 1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 1, 4, 18), which scorned the "enticing words of man's wisdom," then taught in all the schools of rhetoric, especially at Corinth.

²⁴ Gal. iv. 13-15. Mr. Lewin, who adopts this view, finds a confirmation of it in Acts xvii. 15, 19, compared with 1 Thess. iii. 1; as it would be peculiarly distressing to Paul "to be left at Athens alone" while suffering from partial blindness. Assuredly the Apostle would not have "gloried in this infirmity," had it been a strong sensual temptation, as certain Roman Catholics hold, or a proneness to unbelief, as Luther thought.

§ 7. Some time after Barnabas and Saul had returned from this mission—in which the latter had a special opportunity of gaining confidence with his Jewish brethren before entering on his great work among the Gentiles—the signal for that work was divinely given.²⁷ The same Spirit which had been poured on the assembled disciples at Pentecost now spoke to the Church at Antioch, commanding the separation of Barnabas and Saul from among a number of brethren, who are mentioned by name, as if to show both how strong the chief Gentile Church had become in spiritual gifts, and that, if distinction in that Church had been the rule of choice, others might have been preferred before Saul.²⁸ For among the “prophets and teachers” in the Church of Antioch, though Barnabas is named first, Saul is placed last. We should forget the whole method of the divine work in the nurture of the Church, by ascribing to this impulse of the Holy Ghost any startling suddenness, or disconnecting it from the thoughts that were brooding in the minds of the disciples. The recent converts, who had acquired the new name of Christians at Antioch, must often have asked themselves the question, “What is the meaning of this faith of ours, of this baptism, of this incorporation, of this kingdom of the Son of God, *for the world*? The Gospel is not for Judæa alone: here are we called by it at Antioch. Is it meant to stop here?” At every point we find both circumstances and inward reasonings preparing the crisis; and the very attitude of expectation is seen in the fact that they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, when

²⁷ We have again no specific note of time for the interval between the two visits of Barnabas and Paul to Jerusalem in A.D. 44 or 45, and A.D. 48 or 50, which embraces the First Missionary Journey, and the two residences at Antioch, before and after it. As to the season of the journey, Mr. Howson (vol. i. c. 5) argues, with much ingenuity, that if the Apostles started from Seleucia with the first opening of the navigation in early spring, and spent about two months in Cyprus, they would enter upon their upland route from Perga about the end of May, when the snow melts from the passes of the Taurus, and when the natives are accustomed to retire for the hot season to the cool hollows of the highlands. The summer seems a period full short for all

the events at Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, and for the leisurely return to the coast, before the passes and the navigation were again closed. We may therefore include a considerable part of the winter in the rest which seems to have been made at Derbe, and place the return to Syria in the following summer; thus assigning to the whole journey parts of two years, which Conybeare and Howson make A.D. 48 and 49. But the special preparation which we have just seen Paul receiving, and the “long time” afterward spent by Paul and Barnabas at Antioch seem in favor of an earlier date; and accordingly Mr. Lewin agrees with the margin of the A.V. in placing the journey in A.D. 45-46.

²⁸ Acts xiii. 1.

the Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them."²⁹ The "work" could no longer be doubtful to the Church of Antioch; and they could not but see the fitness of the choice of Saul, the accomplished Hellenist, who had already been designated as "a chosen vessel to bear the name of the Lord before the Gentiles, and kings, and the people of Israel;"—and of Barnabas, who had been the first both to recognize the calling of Saul and the work of God among themselves.

All this time, we infer from the form of St. Luke's language—which can not be accidental—that Saul was subordinate to Barnabas. Until *Saul* becomes *Paul*, we read of "Barnabas and Saul;"³⁰ afterward we have both "Paul and Barnabas" and "Barnabas and Paul."³¹ In the latter passage, moreover, they are jointly called *Apostles*, a dignity bestowed on Barnabas (if not before) by this divine call to a work properly apostolic. Just as the mystic number of the *twelve* at first referred to the tribes of Israel, the departure from it by the addition of Saul and Barnabas was one sign of the indefinite extension of the Gospel. When we look back, from the higher ground of St. Paul's apostolic activity, to the years that passed between his conversion and the first missionary journey, we can not observe without reverence the patient humility with which Saul waited for his Master's time. He did not say for once only, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" Obedience to Christ was thenceforth his ruling principle. Submitting, as he believed, to his Lord's direction, he was content to work for a long time as the subordinate colleague of his seniors in the faith. He was thus the better prepared, when the call came, to act with the authority which that call conferred upon him. He left Antioch, however, still the second to Barnabas. Every thing was done with orderly gravity in the sending forth of the two missionaries. Their brethren, after fasting and prayer, laid their hands on them, and so they departed.³²

§ 8. *First Missionary Journey of Barnabas and Saul.*—The two Apostles, with John Mark, the cousin of Barnabas, as a sort of subordinate minister,³³ embarked at Seleucia, the

²⁹ Acts xiii. 2.

³⁰ Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, xiii. 2, 7.

³¹ Acts xiii. 46, xiv. 14.

³² Acts xiv. 3. In a work which does not meddle with ecclesiastical questions, it will be enough to refer to the following passages respecting

the ceremony of ordination, which the Christian Church adopted from the Jewish:—Acts vi. 6; 1 Timothy iv. 14, v. 22; 2 Timothy i. 6; Heb. vi. 2.

³³ Acts xiii. 5: εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην.

port of Antioch, at the mouth of the Orontes, for Salamis in CYPRUS. Besides the constant intercourse between the two ports, which are only distant a few hours' sail, and the natural desire of Barnabas to begin the work among his own kindred, we have seen that there were already Christians in the island, to whom Antioch itself owed in part the preaching of the Gospel; and there were numerous synagogues of Jews. We must observe that, in each of these missionary journeys, the Apostles, though sent forth specially to the Gentiles, never failed first to offer the Gospel to their Jewish brethren. For not only was this the order prescribed by the Lord, but the most hopeful course of reaching the Gentiles was through the proselytes and Hellenistic Jews, though their hardness of heart ultimately frustrated this hope. Such was the order proclaimed by St. Paul in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia:—"The Jews at Jerusalem, in their willful ignorance of the prophets, have fulfilled them in condemning Christ: to you, therefore, children of the stock of Abraham everywhere, is the word of this salvation sent." "It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you; but, seeing that ye also put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles."⁴

In this passage, as at every step in the whole journey, we see the Apostles' own estimate of the *work* to which the Holy Ghost had called them—to *speak the Word of God*; and accordingly they began their ministry at Salamis by preaching the Word of God in the synagogues of the Jews. That Word was the same with which Christ himself had begun his public ministry in the synagogue at Nazareth—the fulfillment of prophecy in the coming of Jesus Christ to be the Saviour of the whole world. Thus they traversed the length of Cyprus, from Salamis on the eastern coast to Paphos on the western.⁵ The latter city, celebrated throughout Greek history for the orgies of Venus, was now the residence of the Roman *proconsul*—for Cyprus, though at first made one of the Cæsar's provinces, was restored by Augustus to the Senate, and we possess a coin of one of its proconsuls of the time of Claudi-

⁴ Acts xiii. 26, 27, 46.

⁵ SALAMIS was situated at the E. end of the island, not far from the modern *Famagousta*. Its harbor is spoken of by Greek writers as very good. PAPHOS was at the W. end of the island, connected by a road with Salamis. It was famous for the worship of Aphrodité (Venus), who was

here fabled to have risen from the sea (Hom. *Od.* viii. 362). Her temple was at "Old Paphos," now called *Kuklia*, and was connected by a short road, often traversed by gay and profligate processions, with the harbor and chief town of "New Paphos," which still preserves the name of *Bæffa*.

us.³⁶ This office was now held by SERGIUS PAULUS, a man of intelligence,³⁷ but, like most of the Roman nobility who at that time took any interest in intellectual pursuits, including the Emperor Claudius, prone to curiosity about the occult oriental learning and magic arts, among the pretenders to which many Jews were conspicuous. Such counterfeits of spiritual power have always proved an influence most hostile to spiritual religion; and the Christians had not only to expose the cheat, but to clear themselves from the suspicion of trading, like the others, upon their spiritual powers. With such an impostor, a magician named Bar-Jesus or Elymas, the Apostles were brought into conflict by the proconsul's desire to hear them. The simple truth for which the better class of Romans were yearning made such an impression on his mind, that Elymas, like Simon Magus at Samaria, became alarmed for his profits, and sought to turn away the proconsul from the faith.³⁸ What sophistry he used the narrative does not record, any more than Paul condescended to refute it, when he exposed its true source in the indignant rebuke:—"O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" These words were not Paul's own, for he spoke them filled with the Holy Ghost, and the authority of the condemnation was proved by the miracle which sent Elymas forth from the presence of the proconsul, blind and seeking for any to lead him by the hand. But the eyes of Sergius Paulus were opened to receive the spiritual light of faith in Christ; and we can not doubt that the example of such a convert gave an impulse to the Gospel among the provincial Romans.³⁹

§ 9. The rebuke of Elymas is introduced by the words, "Then Saul, *who is also* PAUL," which naturally give the first

³⁶ Among the indications of St. Luke's classical knowledge, is the accuracy with which he uses the titles of the Roman provincial governors. The *proconsuls* of the senatorial provinces, Cyprus, Achaia, and Asia, are distinguished by the proper Greek word *ἀνθύπατος*, (translated *deputy* in the A. V., Acts xiii. 7, xviii. 12, xix. 38), from the *legate* of Syria (Luke ii. 2), and the *procurators* of Judæa, as Pilate, Felix, and Festus (Luke iii. 1; Acts xxiii. 24, 26, 33, 34, xxiv. 1, 10). Perhaps it was because the procurators virtually represented to the Jews

the full authority of the emperor, that he denotes both them and the legate by the general term *ἡγεμῶν* (answering to the Latin *præses* and our *governor*), which he applies even to the emperor (Luke iii. 1). Josephus uses *ἡγεμῶν* for the prefect of Syria, and *ἐπίτροπος* (literally *steward*) for the procurator of Judæa.

³⁷ Acts xiii. 7: *ἀνδρὶ συνετῷ*.

³⁸ Acts xiii. 8, where the definite article deserves notice, *the* (Christian) faith. Comp. Acts xiv. 22, xv. 9; Rom. iii. 8, iv. 11, etc.

³⁹ Acts xiii. 12.

impression that the Apostle, or others for him, marked an epoch in his ministry so important as the conversion of the proconsul by adopting his distinguished convert's name. Jerome goes so far as to disparage the surnames which men like Africanus won by their deeds of war, in contrast with this trophy of Paul's victory over heathenism. But such boasting is not after the Apostle's own manner; and the very common occurrence of double names, one Hebrew and one Greek or Roman, among the Jews of this age—Simon Peter, Simeon Niger, Barsabas Justus, John Mark—goes far to justify the belief that a Hellenistic Jew of Tarsus, whom we know to have been free-born, may have been called by both names from his infancy. The invariable use in the "Acts" of *Saul* up to this point, and *Paul* afterward, and the distinct mention which St. Luke himself makes of the transition, is accounted for by the desire to mark the turning-point between Saul's activity among his own countrymen and his new labors as the Apostle of the Gentiles. He is never afterward mentioned by any other name than Paul, whether in the *Acts* or in his own Epistles, and in the allusion to him by St. Peter he is named "our beloved brother Paul."⁴⁰

§ 10. The precedence henceforth assigned to Paul over Barnabas is marked by the statement, that "Paul and his company," setting sail from Paphos, came to Perga in Pamphylia, a city about seven miles up the river Cestrus, which falls into the inmost bight of the bay of Attalia.⁴¹ Small vessels were constantly trading between this port and Paphos; and Paul's course was now directed to the region which adjoined the scene of his former labors in Cilicia, and which gave the readiest access to the districts beyond the Taurus—Pisidia and Lycaonia—which abounded with Jewish synagogues. The passage of that mountain chain, long regarded as one of the great lines of demarkation between the Græco-Roman and Oriental worlds,⁴² marks the epoch at which the Gospel overpassed the limits of Semitic civilization. This new enterprise was beset with dangers. The highlands of Pisidia could only be penetrated by passes, subject to be swept by the sudden rise of the mountain torrents, and infested by

⁴⁰ 2 Pet. iii. 15. See the full discussion of the question of the names in Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. chap. v.

⁴¹ Acts xiii. 13. Perga was celebrated for the worship of Artemis (Diana), whose temple stood on a

hill outside the town. There are extensive remains of Perga at a spot called by the Turks *Eski-Kâlesi*.

⁴² For example, it was the boundary fixed between the Roman and Seleucid empires after the defeat of Antiochus the Great by the Scipios.

the wildest banditti in the world; and the Apostles went forward through "perils of rivers and perils of robbers" only to plunge into "perils from their kindred, perils from the heathen."⁴³ The prospect disheartened the youthful spirit of John Mark, who, "departing from them, returned to Jerusalem."⁴⁴ The ground on which Paul afterward refused to take Mark upon the second missionary journey, even at the cost of a quarrel with such a friend as Barnabas—because "he departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work"—proves that he regarded Mark's desertion as at least a case of grievous instability.⁴⁵ But it hardly follows that Mark was intent solely upon rest in his home at Jerusalem. Had mere cowardice been the cause of his withdrawal, Barnabas would not so soon have chosen him for another journey. His desertion of Paul may have been prompted in part by a wish to rejoin Peter and the Apostles engaged in preaching in Palestine. There is nothing strange in the character of a warm impulsive young man, drawn almost equally toward the two great teachers of the faith, Paul and Peter; with the latter of whom he is always connected by the testimony of ecclesiastical antiquity.⁴⁶ The steadfast kindness of Barnabas gave Mark the opportunity of returning to the work he had deserted, by taking him as his companion to Cyprus after he had separated from Paul; and it is pleasing to find him not only restored to Paul's intimacy during his first imprisonment at Rome, commended to the Church at Colossæ,⁴⁷ and acknowledged as his fellow-laborer,⁴⁸ but to hear Paul, among his last words, desiring that very aid from Mark which he had once rejected:—"Take Mark and bring him with thee, *for he is profitable to me for the ministry.*"⁴⁹ In the interval between St. Paul's first and second imprisonments, Mark seems to have been brought again, by that journey to the East to which Paul alludes as contemplated, into co-operation with Peter, with whom we find him at Babylon, and who speaks of him affectionately as "my son."⁵⁰ Meanwhile his desertion must have added to the anxieties under which Paul and Barnabas plunged into the wilds of Pisidia.

§ 11. Their first halting-place was at ANTIOCH in Pisidia,

⁴³ 2 Cor. xi. 26. ⁴⁴ Acts xiii. 13.

⁴⁵ Acts xv. 37-39.

⁴⁶ We assume, for the present, the identity of John Mark with the Evangelist. See the Appendix on the Lives of the Apostles and Evangelists.

⁴⁷ Col. iv. 10.

⁴⁸ Philem. 24.

⁴⁹ 2 Tim. iv. 11. It is interesting, both in this and the preceding passage, to observe the association of the names of Mark and Luke.

⁵⁰ 1 Pet. v. 13.

founded, like the Syrian Antioch, by Seleucus Nicator, and named after his father Antiochus; a place scarcely second to the other for its importance in the history of Gentile Christianity.⁶¹ It was here that the first formal declaration was made, that the offer of salvation, rejected by the Jews, was handed over to the Gentiles; and here too was first proclaimed the great Pauline doctrine, in which is summed up the essence of Christianity as a saving faith. Like their Master at Nazareth, the Apostles went into the Jewish synagogue on the Sabbath, and sat down. After the usual reading of the Law and the Prophets, they were invited to address the congregation. Then Paul, who from the beginning of this journey appears in the character of the chief speaker, uttered the first of those discourses which, whether in the form of addresses or epistles, abounding in surpassing eloquence as well as powerful reasoning, have ever since formed the great store of Christian theology. Resembling Stephen's defense before the Sanhedrim in its historical basis, it passes lightly over the choice of Israel, their deliverance from Egypt, God's forbearance with them⁶² for forty years in the wilderness, their settlement in Canaan, their government by the Judges and by Saul,—to come to David, the king of God's own choice, of whose seed He proclaims Jesus, the Saviour raised up by God for Israel according to his promise, after John had first preached the baptism of repentance. This word of salvation, he plainly tells his brethren—children of the race of Abraham and all of them that feared God—was sent to *them*, since the people of Jerusalem and their rulers, ignorant of Him and of the voices of the prophets read (as they had just now been read) in the synagogues every Sabbath, had fulfilled them in condemning him. After alluding to the circumstances of Christ's death and burial, in a manner which seems to imply that they were generally known to his hearers, Paul, like Peter in the house of Cornelius, utters the great apostolic testimony to His resurrection, and cites the evidence of his appearances to his Apostles, "who are his witnesses to the people." In the character of such a witness, Paul proclaims the Gospel promised to the fathers, and now fulfilled to their children in the raising up of Jesus, the Son of David and of God, of whom it had been said, "Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see

⁶¹ Its ruins, which are very considerable, are at a place called *Yalobatch*.

⁶² Or, according to the LXX text

of Deut. i. 31 (*ἐτροφοφόρησεν* for *ἐτροποφόρησεν*), "bare them as a nurse carries a child."

corruption,"—words which could not apply to David, and were only true of Christ." Thus far he has developed those historical and prophetic elements of the Gospel which all its first preachers alike proclaimed, and, in preaching "*the forgiveness of sins through this man*," he did but repeat the Gospel message proclaimed by Christ himself, and by Peter on the day of Pentecost. But this is not all. For the first time does a preacher of the Gospel declare its transcendent excellence and adaptation to the great necessity of our fallen race, in that it gives an answer to the question, which had so long agitated and tormented both Jew and Gentile:—*How can a man be just with God?* To give that answer, to prove its reasonableness alike from the Jewish and Gentile point of view, and to maintain it against all the objections of legal righteousness and self-sufficient philosophy—which made the doctrine a stumbling-block to the Jew and foolishness to the Greek—such was the great function of the converted Pharisee. The great motto of his sect was **RIGHTEOUSNESS**—purity, integrity, and perfect obedience to God's holy law—and the first great truth uttered by his new Master was—"Thus it becometh us *to fulfill all righteousness*." But how could this be when all the world was wrong: sinful and corrupt to the very core: lying under the sentence pronounced by God himself—"There is none righteous: no, not one?" In the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, Paul gave forth the text, of which the great arguments of his Epistles are the development:—the doctrine distinctively called *Pauline*, from its great defender, but founded, like all other Christian truth, on ancient prophecy,⁴² and common to all sound Christian teaching—the *articulum stantis aut labentis ecclesiæ*—that *justification by faith in Christ which can not be found in the law of Moses*, much less in any other law of righteousness by man's own strength—"And from all (sins) from which ye could not

⁴² It may be worth while here to correct the mistranslation in a passage which is continually quoted as if service to one's own generation were something nobler than serving God. It should be: "For David having in his own generation" (denoting the limit of that service which ceased with his death) "served the will of God, fell on sleep."

⁴⁴ Is. liii. 11: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniqui-

ties." Compare Paul's argument that Abraham was justified by faith (Rom. iv.) and his examples of justifying faith under the Old Covenant (Heb. xi.). And to these may be added St. James's illustrations of justification by works (Jam. ii.). For the arguments of the two Apostles are antagonistic, not to one another, but to the two phases of the self-righteous and unfruitful Pharisaic doctrine of justification.

be justified by the law of Moses, BY HIM EVERY ONE WHO BELIEVES IS JUSTIFIED." ⁶⁶ Well might he who had to proclaim a truth so strange to the self-righteousness and worldly wisdom of his hearers, conclude by applying to them the words spoken by God through the prophets,—“For I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you ;” ⁶⁷ while, with a prophetic knowledge of the course that the Jews in general would take, he repeats the warning : “Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish.” At first, however, a more promising impression was produced. The Jews ⁶⁸ as they departed from the synagogue—filled, it would seem, with wonder at the novelty of the doctrine—asked that these words might be spoken to them again, either on the next Sabbath or in the interval ; ⁶⁹ and in that interval the Apostles found ample occupation in speaking to the Jews and religious proselytes who followed them, and persuading them to continue in the grace of God.

§ 12. Such was the fruit of these continued labors, that on the following Sabbath almost all the people of the little town flocked to the synagogue to hear the Word of God. But when the Jews saw the Gentiles coming to the same source of religious light as themselves—nay, more, when they who prided themselves on legal righteousness heard sinners of the Gentiles invited to receive through simple faith in Christ a justification which the Law could not give, their envy was roused, and “they contradicted the things spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming.” This sudden outburst of hostility, on the part of those who had been so anxious to hear more of these very truths, reveals the whole spirit of Jewish and Judaizing enmity to the Gospel,—proud exclusiveness revolted by the universal offer of the privileges of God’s kingdom, self-righteousness humiliated by so different a doctrine

⁶⁶ Acts xiii. 38, 39. We supply the word “sins” from the antecedent *ἀμαρτιῶν*, and restore the order, by inverting which our translators have marred the climax. Another sort of climax, that of rationalistic absurdity, is attained by Baur ; who says that these words are “evidently foisted in, to prevent the speech appearing too Petrine, and to give it a slightly Pauline air.” The passage is worth quoting, for the admission of the harmony of the whole discourse with the teaching of Peter.

⁶⁸ Hab. i. 5 : comp. Is. xxix. 14.

The application will be seen more clearly by quoting the latter passage in full : “Therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvelous work and a wonder : for *the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid.*” Comp. 1 Cor. i. 19.

⁶⁹ The word, “Gentiles” (*τὰ ἔθνη*) is wanting in the best MSS.

⁶⁷ Acts xiii. 42 : *εἰς τὸ μετὰ τὸ σάββατον* is the more capable of the latter meaning, inasmuch as the Jews were accustomed to meet in the synagogues on the Monday and Thursday.

of justification. Paul seems at once to have perceived the inveterate character of this hostility, and to have learned the full meaning of his call—not only to preach the Gospel both to Jews and Gentiles, but to preach to the Gentiles the Gospel rejected by the Jews. Nor was Barnabas behind his colleague in conceiving and acting upon this conviction: indeed, the joint mention of the two, whereas Paul alone has been the speaker up to this point, suggests that they were both moved by a direct inspiration to that degree of “boldness,” which was needed for Jews addressing Jews to say, “It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you; but, *seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life*, LO, WE TURN TO THE GENTILES,”—a course which they justify by the same prophecy which was quoted by the aged Simeon at Christ’s first appearance in the Temple.”⁶⁰ The announcement caused great joy among the Gentiles, “and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed: and the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region.”⁶¹ This success raised the anger of the Jews to the highest pitch; and then began the persecution which Paul had now to suffer from them at every step. In these foreign countries, it is not the Cross or Nazareth that is most immediately repulsive to the Jews: it is the wound given to Jewish importance in the association of Gentiles with Jews as the receivers of the good tidings. If the Gentiles had been asked to become Jews, no offense would have been taken. The Jewish proselytes, among whom were many women of distinction and the chief men of the city, seem to have grudged the admission of the Gentiles except by the same gate; and they were easily stirred up to drive Paul and Barnabas out of their bounds. So they, shaking off the dust of their feet against them, as Jesus had commanded,⁶² went on to Iconium, which was situated at the western limit of Lycaonia. But the persecution which expelled them failed to destroy the Church which they had planted at Antioch: “and the disciples were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost.”⁶³ These events at Antioch are evidently related thus fully in the *Acts* as a leading example of the way in which the Gospel was rejected by the Jews and received by the Gentiles in many other cities, and the discourse of Paul furnishes one type, as that at Athens gives another, of his mode of addressing audiences of various kinds.

⁶⁰ Is. xlii. 6, xlix. 6: comp. Luke ii. 32.

⁶¹ Acts xiii. 44-49.

⁶² Matt. x. 14; Mark vi. 11; Luke ix. 5.

⁶³ Acts xiii. 50-52.

§ 13. At ICONIUM,⁶³ as at Antioch, the Apostles began their work by preaching in the synagogue, and gained many converts both among the Jews and Gentiles. Here too the unbelieving Jews raised a persecution, but by the new mode of stirring up disaffection among the Gentiles. Still the Apostles held their ground for a long time, and their testimony was confirmed by many miracles. At length the whole city was divided into two factions; and the hostile Gentiles conspired with their Jewish instigators to raise a riot and stone the Apostles. Warned of the plot, they fled to the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia, where there were no Jewish settlements, and but little Greek civilization; and they preached the Gospel in the cities of Lystra and Derbe.⁶⁴

Here their mission was attested by a miracle, the very counterpart of the first that had been wrought by Peter and John at Jerusalem—the cure of a cripple at Lystra.⁶⁵ The simple natives ascribed the work to a present deity, and exclaimed, in the rude dialect of Lycaonia, “The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men.” Their choice of Barnabas for Jove seems to show that “the Son of Exhortation” was marked by a calm dignity suited to his character, and that Paul was—as he himself says—“in bodily presence weak;” but, as he was the chief speaker, they took him for Hermes (Mercury), the interpreter and messenger of the gods. Their attempt to offer sacrifice to the Apostles called forth a discourse, which may be regarded as a type of those first addressed to mere heathens. Ignorant of the Jewish prophecies, and strangers to the covenants of promise, they acknowledged that simple truth of dependence on a Supreme Being which no race of mankind seems altogether to have lost; and the Apostles, after earnestly avowing themselves to be but men like them,

⁶³ Iconium, now called *Konieh*, was practically the capital of Lycaonia; though Xenophon (*Anab.* i. 2, § 19) terms it the most easterly town of Phrygia. In the Middle Ages it became a place of great consequence, as the capital of the Seljukian sultans. Hence the remains of Saracenic architecture, which are conspicuous here, and which are described by many travelers.

⁶⁴ Acts xiv. i. 7. Lystra was in the heart of the country, and Derbe further to the east, not far from the chief pass which leads up through Taurus, from Cilicia and the coast,

to the central table-land. The exact site of Derbe is uncertain. Lystra is identified with the ruins *Bin-bir-Kilisseh*, at the base of a conical mountain of volcanic structure, named the *Karadagh*. The current legend of Jupiter and Mercury having visited Lycaon in disguise (*Ovid. Met.* i. 163), helps to account for the identification of the Apostles with those deities.

⁶⁵ Acts xiv. 8, 10. The parallel becomes closer if we insert, with Lachmann, the words, “I say unto thee, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ,” before “stand upright on thy feet.”

call upon them to turn from these vanities of idol-worship, "unto the living God, which made heaven and earth and the sea, and all things that are therein." In place of those arguments from Scripture which they had used with the Jews, they appeal to his gifts of "rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness," and all the other goodness whereby he left himself not without a witness, even while he suffered the nations to walk in their own ways. The argument thus briefly stated at Lystra is the same which Paul afterward addressed to the Athenians, and which he works up in the opening of the Epistle to the Romans as the basis of the responsibility of the heathen.⁶⁶ We see presently that this discourse made converts; but the people in general were disappointed at the repulse of the honors they had offered. The easy step from blind worship to rabid persecution was soon taken, at the instigation of certain Jews who came from Antioch and Iconium. Paul was stoned and dragged out of the city for dead; but, as the new disciples stood round him, he revived and returned into the city, whence he and Barnabas departed the next day for Derbe, and there they gained many disciples.⁶⁷

§ 14. This was the furthest point of the present journey; and here they seem to have rested for some time after the dangers they had so narrowly escaped. But, prepared to face those dangers again for the sake of the new converts, they retraced their route through Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and adding to the exhortation to continue in the faith the warning pointed by their own experience—"That we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." Thus they returned to Perga; and then slightly varied their former route by proceeding to the port of Attalia, where they embarked for Antioch.⁶⁸

§ 15. This return journey through Pisidia and Pamphylia is memorable for the first record of the appointment of permanent officers, here called **ELDERS**, for the teaching and guidance, the comfort and government of the churches. We have already had an incidental mention of such officers, even in the churches of Judæa,⁶⁹ which enjoyed the ministry of the

⁶⁶ Acts xiv 13-18: comp. xvii. 23-31; Rom. i.

⁶⁷ Acts xiv. 19-21.

⁶⁸ Acts xiv. 21-26.

⁶⁹ Acts xi. 30; where we have mention of the *elders* of the Church of Jerusalem. *Elder* is the transla-

tion of the equivalent word, which we still preserve in its Greek form of *presbyter*, and which is contracted, through the old French forms *prester* and *prestre*, into *priest*. It is the more important to remember this etymology, as *priest* is commonly used in

Apostles and of the prophets and teachers who had been the associates of the Apostles. Much more did the newly-planted churches which Paul and Barnabas were leaving to themselves—severed from those of Judæa and Syria by the Taurus and another language—need to have the means of edification and order complete within themselves; and so they *ordained them* ELDERS *in every church*, and commended them to the Lord, with the prayer and fasting which form a perpetual model for every appointment of Christian ministers.⁷⁰

§ 16. The report of this *First Missionary Journey*, made to the assembled Church of Antioch by Paul and Barnabas, furnished a decisive proof that the prophetic intimations, in consequence of which they were sent forth, were fulfilled; and that “God had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles.” Paul and Barnabas had already for some time returned to their ordinary labors at Antioch,⁷¹ when the prospects of the Gentile converts were imperiled by that Judaizing spirit, to which may be traced all the heresies that began to trouble the Church even in the Apostolic age. Certain men which came down from Judæa taught the brethren—“Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved.” Paul was supported by Barnabas in that vigorous opposition to this attempt to conjure back the genius of Christianity within the cast-off shell of Judaism, which is now so familiar to us in his Epistles. After no small dissension and disputation, the Church decided that Paul and Barnabas, with other brethren, should go up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and Elders about this question. As they traveled by land through Phœnicia and Samaria, they caused great joy to the brethren in those regions by declaring the conversion of the Gentiles; nor were they less cordially received, at least in the first

secular literature as the translation of *ἑρεῦς*. The word *presbyterian* does not signify that the religious denomination described by it have any exclusive possession of *presbyters* or *elders*, but that they have their own distinctive views of the position and functions of such officers. It should also be observed that the Greek language discriminates, even more carefully than the English, between the *official* use of these terms and the employment of words of the same derivation in the sense of age.

⁷⁰ Acts xiv. 23.

⁷¹ Acts xiv. 27, 28. The *χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον* of this passage is interpreted by Conybeare and Howson of the year 49-50, by Mr. Lewin of the whole year 47, with parts of 46 and 48. Mr. Lewin himself remarks that no long interval could have elapsed between the return of Paul and Barnabas to Antioch and their journey to Jerusalem, inasmuch as they proclaimed by the way the conversion of the Gentiles as recent intelligence.

instance, by the Church at Jerusalem, with the Apostles and Elders."⁷²

§ 17. This brings us into contact with one of the difficulties in St. Paul's history. In the *Epistle to the Galatians*⁷³ he gives an account of a visit that he paid to Jerusalem, fourteen years after that first visit which took place three years from his conversion.⁷⁴ What he tells us of this visit seems inconsistent with any of those recorded in the *Acts*, save that now before us; and, as Paley holds, it is clear that the visit of *Gal. ii.* is either that of *Acts xv.* or that it is not mentioned in the *Acts* at all. From *Gal. ii.* it appears that the visit there described was made *after* Paul's great success among the heathen, and *not after* the decision of the Church recorded in *Acts xv.*, so that the only time left for the visit is the interval during which Luke tells us that Paul and Barnabas abode at Antioch a long time with the disciples.⁷⁵ Of course this phrase does not exclude a private journey to Jerusalem; but we must not supply such an event without positive evidence. Nay, more, the occasion named in the Epistle can scarcely have arisen so soon, for no cause of the doubt "lest by any means he should run or had run in vain" is suggested, except through that opposition of the Judaizers which was the immediate cause of the visit related in *Acts xv.* The objection, that no mention is made in the *Galatians* of the visit mentioned in *Acts xi.* and *xii.*, disappears at once, when we observe that Paul is writing of his communications with the Apostles *in relation to his ministry among the Gentiles.* And this consideration supplies so strong a proof of the one occasion on which alone the visit could have taken place, that the other objections are best answered by interweaving the two narratives.⁷⁶

The clear judgment concerning the course they had pursued, which had made Paul and Barnabas firm in their resistance to the Judaizers, did not scorn confirmation by the judgment of the other Apostles and of the Church. That conscientious self-searching which kept Paul alive, in the full career of his success, to the fear lest after preaching to others he might himself be a castaway, led him now to face the question raised by the Judaizers, whether he had been misguided in his recent course or in its purposed resumption. Side by side with the resolution of the Church of Antioch, to seek

⁷² Acts xv. 1-4. ⁷³ Gal. ii. 1-10.

⁷⁴ Gal. ii. 18. ⁷⁵ Acts xiv. 28.

⁷⁶ The opinion of Mr. Lewin, identifying this journey with that which Paul

paid to Jerusalem at the close of his Second Circuit, in A.D. 58 or 54, will be best noticed when we come to that point in the narrative.

light from their brethren at Jerusalem, was a divine impulse prompting Paul himself to confer with his brother Apostles. He "went up by revelation," as well as deputed by the Church.⁷⁶ The private conferences which he himself mentions are not only thus perfectly consistent with the public proceedings recorded in the Acts, but the narrative of the latter leaves room for the former in the interval between the first reception of Paul and Barnabas and the beginning of the Pharisaic opposition.⁷⁷ Paul himself says that he communicated to them the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles—referring doubtless to the report which Luke mentions as first made by Paul and Barnabas to the whole Church⁷⁸—and then adds, "but separately to those of reputation,"⁷⁹ and especially to James, Peter and John. The result of these private conferences is in perfect accordance with the public debate and decision related by St. Luke. The reputed "pillars" of the Church "added nothing to Paul"—no new truth for him and his converts to learn, no new law for them to observe. As if to bring the chief question to a practical issue, Paul and Barnabas had taken with them Titus, who, though a Greek, was not required to be circumcised.⁸⁰ The Apostles at Jerusalem cordially recognized what God himself had made clear, that "the Gospel of the uncircumcision" had been committed to Paul, like "the Gospel of the circumcision" to Peter, and that the one could show miracles as convincing as the other; and they gave Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, as the pledge of the solemn compact, that these two should go to the Gentiles and they themselves to the Jews. St. Paul adds one point which proves that, amid these questions of doctrine and ritual, all the Apostles were agreed on the supreme importance of the fruit of practical beneficence in Christianity:—"Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do."⁸¹

§ 18. The public discussion of the great question by the whole Church was brought on by "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed."⁸² The strong language of Paul implies that, besides Christians who had not yet overcome their Jewish prejudices, some at least of these opponents were Jews who had made a false profession, either to find grounds of

⁷⁶ Gal. ii. 2.

⁷⁷ Acts xv. 4, 5. ⁷⁸ Acts xv. 4.

⁷⁹ Gal. ii. 2: *τοῖς δοκοῦσι*, the same phrase which our translators have unfortunately rendered differently in

v. 6, and the recurrence of which in v. 9 marks its reference to James, Peter and John.

⁸⁰ Gal. ii. 3.

⁸¹ Gal. ii. 6-10.

⁸² Acts xv. 5.

accusation against the Christians or to lead them back by another route to Judaism."⁸³ Joining in the mutual congratulations of the brethren on the conversion of the Gentiles, they yet contended that such converts could only be received into the Church through the door of Judaism,—“It was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.”⁸⁴ The question thus raised involved the whole issue of the adaptation of Christianity to the world—to man as man in every state.

It is to be observed that the Apostles did not exercise the power, which they might doubtless have assumed as involved in their mission, of legislating on the matter. They came together with the Elders: the whole body of the Church⁸⁵ at Jerusalem were not only present with one accord, but took part in the decision; and it was embodied in a letter drawn up in the name of the Apostles, and Elders, and brethren.⁸⁶ It was not till after much discussion among those who are not named, that Peter stood up to remind the brethren that the principle at issue had been already settled by his mission to Cornelius, when God gave the same witness of the Holy Ghost to the believing Gentiles that he had given to the believing Jews. Nay, more, he shows the reason of this in the essential character of the new dispensation, that it relates to man's inner life; and so “God, which knoweth the *hearts*,” passing over what was external in the relations of these converts to the Mosaic rites, “purified their *hearts* through *faith*.” And as they believed that salvation came to both Jew and Gentile alike through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, it was a mere tempting of God to add a yoke which even those lawfully subjected to it had never been able to bear.” Then, amid the silent attention of the whole multitude, Paul and Barnabas related the facts to which Peter had appealed, “declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by them.”⁸⁷ James, the only other Apostle who is reported as speaking,—the Apostle who was most intimately connected with the Church of Jerusalem, and who had the greatest weight with the Jewish party,—sums up the discussion. With incomparable simplicity and wisdom he binds up the testimony of recent facts with the testimony of ancient prophecy, and gives a practical judgment upon the question.⁸⁸

⁸³ Gal. ii. 4: “Because of *false brethren unawares brought in*, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.”

⁸⁴ Acts xv. 5.

⁸⁵ *πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος*.

⁸⁶ Acts xv. 6, 12, 22, 23, 25.


⁸⁷ Acts xv. 7-11. ⁸⁸ Acts xv. 12.

⁸⁸ Acts xv. 13-21.

§ 19. His judgment was adopted by the Apostles and Elders and brethren. They wrote to the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, disavowing the men who, they say, "going out from us, troubled you with words" (or disputations), and bearing emphatic testimony to Paul and Barnabas, as the "beloved, who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ." The judgment which they then pronounce they declare to be that of the Holy Ghost, as well as their own—referring doubtless to some sign vouchsafed to the assembly. That judgment was, that no further burden should be laid upon the Gentile converts, "except these, which must of necessity be borne"—burdens only to those who had been used to the polluting rites of heathenism—"that ye abstain from *meats offered to idols*, and from *blood*, and from things *strangled*, and from fornication."^o The injunction that the Gentiles should abstain from pollutions of idols and from fornication explained itself: the abstinence from things strangled and from blood is desired as a concession to the customs of the Jews who were to be found in every city, and for whom it was still right, when they had believed in Jesus Christ, to observe the Law.

By this decision, the Apostles and Church at Jerusalem—the natural guardians of whatever it might have been right to preserve in the ancient dispensation—gave their solemn and final approval to that version of the Gospel which Paul had preached by the revelation given to him. The emancipation of the Gentile converts from Jewish rites involved far more than their personal liberty. It abolished that separation of the race of Israel from the other nations, of which circumcision was the sign and seal; and, in place of the divine favor of which they boasted as the sons of Abraham, acceptance with God was offered to Jew and Gentile in common through the new spiritual bond of faith in Christ. And, as the speech of St. Peter declares, this view of the Gospel was of no less vital moment to the Jew than to the Gentile. If the Jewish believers were thrown back on the Jewish law, and gave up the free and absolute grace of God, the Law became a mere burden, just as heavy to the Jew as it would be to the Gentile. The only hope *for the Jew* was in a Saviour who must be *the Saviour of mankind*. Thus the decision of the Jewish Church agrees with the teaching of St. Paul's Epistles; and the agreement between him and the other Apostles—that he

^o Acts xv. 22-29. These are sometimes called the *Apostolic Precepts*, as a parallel to the *Noachic Precepts* of Gen. ix. 4-6.



should go to the Gentiles, and they to the circumcision—as surely did not imply that different versions of the Gospel were to be preached to the Gentiles and the Jews. And that this one doctrine of a common faith in Jesus Christ might prove to be the seed of union in a holy life, the richer Gentiles were admonished to remember their poorer brethren in Palestine.⁹¹ How ready they were to discharge this duty, had already been shown in the former mission of Paul to Jerusalem; and his Epistles bear witness to his constancy in urging its systematic performance.

§ 20. But questions, which have been once for all settled in principle, are ever liable to be reopened in practice, not only by the opposition of malcontents, but by the infirmities of sincere men; and, besides the life-long contest which Paul had to maintain with the Judaizers, there was one memorable occasion on which he was compelled to reprove Peter himself for his compliance with the Judaizing spirit. On a visit to Antioch, which seems to have occurred not long after these events, Peter proved his full adoption of the new law of liberty by eating with the Gentiles, till certain Jewish Christians “came from James;” when, for fear of them, he withdrew from all such intercourse. The other Jews, to use the strong phrase of Paul, “played the hypocrite with him,” and even Barnabas was carried away with the rest. St. Paul, regarding their conduct as an open departure from “walking uprightly *according to the truth of the Gospel*,” “withstood Peter to the face, because he was to be blamed,” and said to him before them all, “If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles and not of the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to Judaize?”⁹² This was no opposition of Pauline to Petrine views; it was a faithful rebuke of blamable moral weakness. It has been well observed that the argument of St. Paul would have lost its force if St. Peter had been really of opinion that the law was obligatory on Gentile converts. “The point of St. Paul’s rebuke is plainly this—that, in sanctioning the Jewish feeling which regarded eating with the Gentiles as an unclean thing, St. Peter was *untrue to his principles*, was acting hypocritically and from fear.”⁹³ The result shows a magnanimity only to be ascribed to “a double portion” of the Holy Spirit resting on the Church as well as on them.

And as, happily, no dispute had yet arisen between the churches, so there is no ground for calling the assembly at

⁹¹ Gal. ii. 10. ⁹² Gal. ii. 11-14. ⁹³ Professor Lightfoot, *On the Galatians*.

Jerusalem the *First General Council*. It was no meeting of delegates from all the churches, for even those sent from Antioch went rather to consult the sister church, and especially the Apostles, than to represent the views of their own church; and the divine basis on which the decision is placed takes it quite out of the category of synodical sentences, which decide, without extinguishing, a grave difference of opinion, by the mere voice of a majority. If in any sense the First Council of the Church, it was the last which had a right to say, "It seemed good *to the Holy Ghost* and to us."

As a personal confirmation of their letter, the Church of Jerusalem sent back, with Paul and Barnabas, Judas Barsabas and Silas,^a "chief men among their brethren," who, being prophets, added their exhortations and encouragement to the joy and consolation which the letter caused. When their ministry was fulfilled, Judas returned to Jerusalem; but Silas continued some time at Antioch, where Paul and Barnabas also resumed their labors. To complete this view as the extension of the Gospel to the Gentile world, we shall soon see that about this time it reached Rome itself.

^a This is the Greek abbreviated form of the Latin name *Silvanus*.



Thessalonica.

CHAPTER XVI.

ST. PAUL'S SECOND, OR GREAT MISSIONARY JOURNEY, AND THE ENTRANCE OF THE GOSPEL INTO EUROPE. A.D. 49 OR 51-53 OR 54.

§ 1. Time and extent of the *Second Missionary Journey*—Quarrel of Paul and Barnabas—Paul accompanied by Silas. § 2. Visit to Syria, Cilicia, and Lycaonia—Timothy at Lystra—His ordination and circumcision—He goes forth with Paul and Silas. § 3. Journey through Phrygia and Galatia—Illness of Paul—His reception by the Galatians—The Churches of Galatia. § 4. Preaching in Bithynia and Asia divinely forbidden—St. Paul at Troas—Vision of the man of Macedonia—Luke joins the apostolic band. § 5. Voyage to Macedonia—Neapolis—PHILIPPI: its outer market and its Jewish oratory—Conversion of Lydia. § 6. The possessed damsel healed by Paul—Paul and Silas scourged and imprisoned—Conversion of the jailer—" *Civis Romanus sum* "—Release and departure of Paul and Silas—The Church of the Philippians. § 7. THESSALONICA, the Roman capital of Macedonia—Paul in the Synagogue—Riot stirred up by the Jews—Departure of Paul and Silas—Teaching of St. Paul at Thessalonica. § 8. BERGÆ—Noble-mindedness of the Jews there—Tumult excited by Jews from Thessalonica—Paul leaves Bergæ, and sails to ATHENS. § 9. He waits for Silas and Timotheus—His emotions at the sight of the city—His

disputes with the Jews and Greeks in the Synagogue and the Agora—Character of the Athenians—Paul encountered by the Stoics and Epicureans. § 10. His *Discourse* at the Areopagus—Paul's revelation of the UNKNOWN GOD, the Universal Father—Rebuke of idolatry—Preaching of repentance and judgment by Him whom God hath raised—Interruption of the discourse, and departure of St. Paul—Athenian converts. § 11. CORINTH: its importance in the history of Paul—The old Greek city and the new Roman colony—Its population of Greeks, Romans and Jews. § 12. Paul lives at Corinth with Aquila and Priscilla, working with his own hands—His reasons for this course. § 13. Paul visits the Synagogue—Arrival of Silas and Timothy: Paul "constrained by the word"—His plain proclamation of Christ crucified—Rejected by the Jews, he turns to the Greeks—The *Epistles to the Thessalonians* written from Corinth—Paul's autograph salutation, to prove his letters genuine, and to add emphasis to truth. § 14. Gallio proconsul of Achaia—Tumult of the Jews against Paul—Gallio's impartial toleration. § 15. Paul's vow at Cenchreae, before sailing with Aquila and Priscilla—His voyage to Ephesus, and visit to the Synagogue—Aquila and Priscilla remain at Ephesus. § 16. Paul lands at Cæsarea, and goes up to Jerusalem—Connection of this visit with his future work—Contest with Judaizing teachers, and relief of Jewish Christians—Paul returns to Antioch: end of his *Second Missionary Journey*—Death of Claudius, and accession of NERO.

§ 1. The *Second Missionary Journey* of St. Paul, besides its wide extent and long duration, is memorable for the introduction of Christianity into Europe; though the Apostle's labors were still confined to that eastern division of the Roman Empire which was marked by the Adriatic. The journey extended over the space of three or four years, of which eighteen months were spent at Corinth. Beginning at Antioch, it embraced Cilicia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Galatia, Mysia and the Troad; and, in Europe, Macedonia, Athens and Corinth; whence Paul crossed the Ægean to Ephesus, and thence sailed to Cæsarea, and so, after a hasty visit to Jerusalem, returned to Antioch.¹ Its beginning was "some days" after the so-called Council at Jerusalem, but that the interval could not have been very long is proved by the fact that upon this journey Paul delivered the decrees to the churches of Syria and Cilicia, to whom they were addressed. Dr. Howson places the commencement of the circuit in A.D. 51, Mr. Lewin in A.D. 49, and it ended, according to the latter, in the autumn of A.D. 53, according to the former in the summer of A.D. 54.

This great enterprise began with no parade of promises or preparation, but in the natural proposal of Paul to Barnabas

¹ Acts xv. 36–xviii. 24. In the latter passage, the usual faulty arrangement of chapters slurs over the division between the second and third journeys.

that they should revisit the brethren in all the cities where they had preached the Gospel, and inquire after their welfare.² But it was probably not without some prophetic view of the great trials of courage and steadfastness which awaited him, that he refused the proposal of Barnabas to take John Mark again with them. The plain language of St. Luke implies a sharp personal quarrel,³ embittered perhaps on the side of Barnabas by the rebuke he had lately shared with Peter. But the providence of God overruled human infirmities, and the result of the separation of the former comrades was that two apostolic missions went forth instead of one. Barnabas, with Mark, sailed as before to Cyprus, his native island;⁴ and he is not again mentioned in the Acts. In the Epistles, however, Paul not only refers to his old comrade with affection and respect,⁵ but in a later passage he seems to imply that Barnabas was still laboring among the Gentiles, maintained, like himself, by the work of his own hands.⁶ Paul found a new companion in SILAS, whom we have seen transferred from Jerusalem to Antioch; and it was not long before the little band was increased by the most congenial fellowship of TIMOTHY. Hence the laborers in this work are described by the Apostle himself by the formula,—“Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus.”⁷ LUKE, as is clearly shown by the sudden transition of his narrative to the first person and back again to the third, joined Paul’s company at Alexandria Troas, but was left behind at Philippi, and he does not appear again in this journey.⁸

§ 2. Commended by the brethren to the grace of God, Paul and Silas first visited the churches of Syria and Cilicia; probably those which the Apostle had planted soon after his conversion.⁹ The statement that Paul *confirmed* these churches seems to have a particular reference to the recent Judaistical controversy; for “the decrees decided upon by the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem,” which we presently find Paul and Silas enjoining upon the brethren in every city that they visited, were addressed to the Gentiles *in Syria and Cilicia*.¹⁰ And here Silas would be able to discharge the same office for which he had first been sent to Antioch, as a personal witness to the decision of the Church at Jerusalem.

Crossing the Taurus by one of the more eastern passes—

² Acts xv. 36. ³ παροξυσμός.

⁴ Acts xv. 37-39.

⁵ Gal. ii. 1, 9, 13.

⁶ 1 Cor. ix. 6.

⁷ 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1.

⁸ Acts xvi. 10, xvii. 1.

⁹ Acts xv. 40, 41: comp. Gal. i. 21.

¹⁰ Acts xvi. 4: comp. xv. 23.

probably the usual route through the Cilician Gates—Paul traversed his old ground in Lycaonia, but in the reverse order, by Derbe, Lystra and Iconium.¹¹ The general statement, that “the churches were established in the faith, and increased (or abounded) in number daily,” is varied by one most interesting episode. At Lystra, Paul found a disciple named TIMOTHEUS, the offspring of one of those mixed marriages which had become common in this later period of Jewish history. His father was a *Greek*, that is, of heathen origin, and, if a proselyte at all (which is nowhere stated), certainly not more than a proselyte of the gate.¹² His mother belonged to that class of devout Jewish women who have already been mentioned in the account of Paul's first journey through these parts. From the very cursory notice of his father, without any mention of his name, it has been inferred that Timothy was left in infancy to the sole care of his mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois, who taught him from a child to know the Holy Scriptures.¹³ It was from them also that the youth derived his first impressions of Christian truth; for St. Paul seems clearly to describe the order in which the family embraced it, when he calls to remembrance the unfeigned faith “which dwelt first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and, I am persuaded, in thee also.”¹⁴ The absence of any synagogue at Lystra has suggested the picture of these devout women going forth to their daily worship at some oratory, like that by the river at Philippi,¹⁵ where, like Lydia, their hearts, prepared by the Jewish Scriptures, were opened to receive the teaching of Paul when he visited the city on his first journey. To the lessons which they gave Timothy in the new faith, was added the deep im-

¹¹ Acts xvi. 1, 2. The visit to Iconium—which follows almost of necessity from the route chosen—is clearly implied in v. 2. With regard to Timothy's connection with these places, there are various opinions. The seeming vagueness of Acts xvi. 1 is removed by referring the *ἐκεῖ* to the immediate antecedent *Λύστραν*; and that this was Timothy's home is confirmed by the mention of Lystra, without Derbe, in v. 2, and in 2 Tim. iii. 11. The reputation which Timothy enjoyed at Iconium, as well as Lystra (v. 2), shows the intercourse which we might have expected between the newly-planted churches in

Lycaonia. From the language of v. 3, immediately after the mention of Iconium—where the Jews were numerous, while there seems to have been no synagogue at Lystra—it has been inferred that the circumcision of Timothy took place at Iconium; but the phrase is only indefinite, “Because of the Jews in those places.”

¹² Acts xvi. 1, 3.

¹³ 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15.

¹⁴ 2 Tim. i. 5. This is made still clearer if we adopt Lachmann's reading in 2 Tim. iii. 14, *παρὰ τίνων* (for *παρὰ τίνος*), “of whom (pl.) thou learnedst.”

¹⁵ Acts xvi. 13.

pression made on the youth's ardent and sensitive mind by the labors and sufferings of the Apostle, who does not hesitate thus to appeal to him:—"But thou hast fully known (lit. traced step by step) my doctrine, manner of life, purpose, faith, long-suffering, charity, patience, persecutions, afflictions, which came unto me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra;"¹⁶ and the lesson, that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God, seems to have led Timothy to keep down a temperament somewhat prone to youthful lusts by an ascetic rigor beyond the power of his weak bodily frame.¹⁷ The sensitive spirit, which was easily moved to tears¹⁸ and shrank from opposition and responsibility,¹⁹ struck a sympathetic chord in the heart of Paul, whose tenderness to his "own son in the faith," mingled with the faithfulness of his exhortations, has dictated some of the most touching passages in the New Testament.

These intimate relations date from Paul's second journey, when the Apostle, on arriving at Lystra, "would have him to go forth with him." During the interval of seven years, Timothy had grown up to manhood, and the "good report," which his character had gained from the brethren at Iconium as well as Lystra, leads us to believe that he had been already employed in what was afterward to be the great labor of his life as "the messenger of the churches," and that it was his tried fitness for that office which determined St. Paul's choice. Those who had the deepest insight into character, and who spoke with a prophetic utterance, pointed to him,²⁰ as others had pointed before to Paul and Barnabas,²¹ as specially fit for the missionary work in which the Apostle was engaged. Personal feeling led St. Paul to the same conclusion, and Timothy was solemnly set apart—the whole assembly of the Elders laying their hands upon him, as did the Apostle himself—to do the work and possibly to bear the title of *Evangelist*.²²

But, before they went forth to the work, Paul "took and circumcised him, because of the Jews which were in those quarters: for they all knew that his father was a Greek,"²³—an act the more remarkable, as Paul was engaged in deliver-

¹⁶ 2 Tim. ii. 10, 11. The mention of Antioch and Iconium does not necessarily imply, that Timothy witnessed Paul's sufferings at those places. It is enough to suppose that, having seen the events at Lystra, he heard with interest of those at the other cities.

¹⁷ 1 Tim. v. 2, 23. ¹⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 4.

¹⁹ 1 Tim. iv. 12-16, v. 20, 21, vi. 11-14; 2 Tim. ii. 1-7.

²⁰ 1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14.

²¹ Acts xiii. 2.

²² Acts xvi. 1-3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6, iv. 5.

²³ Acts xvi. 8.

ing to the churches the decree made at Jerusalem, where Titus had been expressly exempted from circumcision. But Titus, so far as we know, was a Greek, without any intermixture of Jewish blood; while Timothy, as the son of a Jewess, would appear to the Jews in the light of a negligent Israelite, the seal of whose profession had been disowned from his very infancy. That no offense had been felt hitherto, may be explained by the predominance of the Gentile element in the churches of Lycaonia.²⁴ But now his wider work would bring him into contact with the Jews, and the scandal would frustrate all his efforts as an Evangelist. So, in this case, Paul "became unto the Jews as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews." It is assuredly a conspicuous example of simple faithfulness in the narrative of the Acts, that St. Luke should have recorded the incident without any further explanation to guard against the charge of inconsistency. None the less did Paul and Silvanus, with their new companion, "go through the cities, enjoining them to keep the decrees ordained by the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem. And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily."²⁵

§ 3. At Iconium, or possibly at Antioch, they left the track of Paul's first journey, and—doubtless guided by those divine directions which attended each successive stage of their progress—they turned northward into the central region of Asia Minor, which is described by the general phrase of "*Phrygia*"²⁶ and the region of *Galatia*;" and all that we learn further from St. Luke of their course through the peninsula is this:—Being forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia (the Roman province), they came into the eastern border of Mysia, and endeavored to enter Bithynia; but the Spirit of Jesus did not permit them. So they passed through Mysia into the Troad; and there, at the city of Alexandria Troas, Paul saw the vision which called them over into Europe.²⁷

This brief outline may be in part filled up from St. Paul's

²⁴ Acts xiv. 27.

²⁵ Acts xvi. 4, 5.

²⁶ We know absolutely nothing of the labors of the Apostle in Phrygia, nor of any of its cities in which he founded churches; for Colossæ, though belonging ethnologically to Phrygia, was included in Asia, which he was forbidden to enter; nor does it seem clear that he ever visited Co-

lossæ. (See below, in the account of Colossæ, chap. xviii. § 16). Politically, Phrygia was comprised in the proconsular province of Asia; Galatia was under the government of an imperial proprætor.

²⁷ Acts xvi. 6-9. Mr. Lewin assigns the whole year, A.D. 50, to the labors of Paul in Phrygia and Galatia.

Epistle to the Galatians. That people were the descendants of the great Celtic hordes which, repulsed in their attack on Northern Greece in the 3d century B.C., had overflowed the bounds of Europe, and occupied the central table-land of Asia Minor.²⁸ There, adopting the Greek language, and hence called *Gallogræci*, they practiced the enthusiastic Phrygian orgies of Cybele, the mother of the-Gods, with the natural fervor of their impulsive race. Such a people presented a most interesting field for the preacher of the Gospel; and it appears that an attack of illness, which detained Paul in their country, gave him a prolonged opportunity of laboring among them.²⁹ His infirmity appears to have moved sympathy rather than scorn among a people of generous impulses. With the extravagance of their race, they welcomed him as an angel of God, yea, as Jesus Christ himself; they greeted him with those "blessings"³⁰ which flow so freely from the Celtic tongue; and he himself, when compelled to remonstrate with their truly Celtic instability, bears them witness that, "had it been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me."³¹ Nor is the Apostle's testimony less emphatic to the simple character of that Gospel, the same amid these pastoral Celts that he afterward made his sole message to the refined Corinthians—"Jesus Christ, evidently set forth, crucified among you"—"the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ," as the only object of which he would boast;³² and which proved its power among them by leveling every distinction between Jew and Gentile, slave and free-man.³³ How soon the Judaizers removed them from him that called them to the grace of Christ unto another Gospel, which was not another, but an invention of those who desired to

²⁸ There is no real difference between the names of *Galli* and *Galatæ*. As the Greek writers called the Celts of Gallia *Γαλαται*, so the Latin writers called those of Galatia *Galli*. *Γαλαται* is the same word as *Κέλται* and as *Kelt*, the generic name of the Celtic race; but the people are believed to have belonged rather to the Cymric than the Gaelic subdivision of the race.

²⁹ This is the plain grammatical sense of *δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς* in Gal. iv. 13: "Ye know how *through infirmity of the flesh* I preached the Gospel among you at the first." But

some of the best commentators hold that, instead of construing Paul's Hebraistic Greek thus strictly, we should read "*in infirmity of the flesh.*" In either case, the Apostle seems to refer to a more than ordinary pressure of that bodily infirmity, of which he speaks elsewhere as detracting from the influence of his personal address.

³⁰ *μακαρισμός*. It has been suggested that this may refer to their calling him one of the *μάκαρες θεοί*.

³¹ Gal. iv. 13-15.

³² Gal. iii. 1, vi. 14: comp. 1 Cor. i. 13, 17, ii. 2.

³³ Galatians iii. 28.

trouble the converts and pervert the Gospel of Christ," we shall see presently. Meanwhile it should be observed that we have no mention of any central church founded in any of the Galatian cities, not even Ancyra, the capital, being so much as named.²⁶ The churches of Galatia²⁷ were doubtless scattered among the villages of that patriarchal people; and this isolation may have exposed them the more readily to the attacks of the Judaizing perverters who systematically dogged the footsteps of Paul.

§ 4. Of the reasons for which the Apostolic band were forbidden to enter Bithynia or to preach the Gospel in Asia,²⁸ the sacred narrative is silent. We might conjecture that the time was not yet come for a direct encounter with the powerful governments and corrupt society of those provinces. But it is of more profit to observe the fact that their path, thus hedged up on the right and the left, was guided to the spot, where it was revealed that they had been thus brought down to the extremity of Asia in order to carry over the Gospel into Europe. Nearly four centuries had passed since the Macedonian conqueror crossed the narrow strait of the Hellespont to overthrow the great despotism that enthralled Asia, and now, near that plain of Troy on which Alexander stayed to indulge the dream of rivaling the fame of his ancestor Achilles, at the very city named in the conqueror's honor,²⁹ St. Paul beheld in vision another "man of Macedo-

²⁶ Gal. i. 7.

²⁷ Ancyra (now *Angora*), famed for the discovery of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, inscribed with Augustus's own account of his reign, was the meeting-place of all the great roads in the north of the peninsula. Its importance dates from the imperial age.

²⁸ Gal. i. 2.

²⁷ It is not said that they were forbidden to enter Asia, through which, in fact, a part of their route necessarily lay, for Mysia and the Troad were included in proconsular Asia. Perhaps, in this passage, the name of Asia may be confined to Ionia.

²⁹ The *Troas* of Acts xvi. and xx., 2 Cor. 12, 13, and 2 Tim. iv. 13, seems clearly to signify a city; and the name of Troas simply is applied also by other writers to the sea-port of Alexandria Troas, the most flourishing city of the Troad in the Greek

and Roman ages. It was built by Antigonus on the W. coast of Mysia, opposite Tenedos, and was originally named *Antigonia Troas*; but Lysimachus changed its name to Alexandria. The honor with which the Greeks cherished a city built on ground consecrated by the memories of Achilles and Alexander, was rivaled by the reverence of the Romans for the presumed cradle of their race. The city was made a colony, with the *Jus Italicum*; and these associations seem to have combined with its local position to induce both Julius and Augustus to meditate the transfer of the seat of empire to Alexandria (Suet. *Cæs.* 79; Hor. *Carm.* iii. 3, 57). When the scheme of an oriental capital was carried out by Constantine, his first choice was Alexandria, and his intention is commemorated by the modern name of the ruins, *Eski-Stamboul*.

nia,"³⁹ uttering the cry of the western world suffering beneath the despotism of sin, and calling to the soldiers of the cross, "Come over and help us." The power which had led Europe to the armed conquest of Asia was the first to invite conquest from the spiritual force of which Asia had been the primeval cradle. Not a doubt could enter the Apostle's mind about the nature of the "help" he was called to give; and so LUKE, speaking now in the first person, as having here joined Paul and Timothy and Silas, says, "Immediately we endeavored to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us to preach the Gospel unto them."⁴⁰ It is, perhaps, not too arbitrary a conjecture, that the Apostle, having recently suffered in health, derived benefit from the medical skill of the "beloved physician."

§ 5. The very elements seemed to concur with the Apostle's obedience to the heavenly vision; and the voyage, which on a later occasion occupied five days,⁴¹ was now performed in two, the ship keeping a straight course past Tenedos and Imbros to the lofty island of Samothracia, and thence on the following day to Neapolis, on the Strymonic Gulf.⁴² From this port they followed the great Roman road (*Via Egnatia*), over the rocky ridge of Symbolum, the prolongation of Mount Pangæus, descending into the plain of PHILIPPI, memorable for the defeat of Brutus and Cassius. To celebrate that event, Augustus had founded a Roman colony near the site of the more ancient city built by the great Macedonian, probably to replace the still older factory established by the Phœnicians for the working of the gold mines of Pangæus and Thasos. The Macedonian and Roman city alike formed a frontier post against the barbarians of Thrace; and Philippi was now the chief city of Eastern Macedonia, though the capital of the province was at Thessalonica.⁴³

As being more a military than a commercial city, it was not

(*Old Constantinople*). The harbor, which is still distinctly traceable, was the great port for voyagers between Macedonia and Asia Minor.

³⁹ It is impossible to overlook the coincidence of the phrase with the ἀνὴρ Μαιεδών of Demosthenes—the enslaver of Greece. (Demosth. *Philipp.* i. p. 43.)

⁴⁰ Acts xvi. 9, 10.

⁴¹ Acts xx. 6. This was the return voyage from Philippi (Neapolis) to Troas, on his Third Missionary Journey.

⁴² Acts xvi. 11. For a full discussion of the site of Neapolis, which is probably the modern *Cavalla*, see the *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.

⁴³ Acts xvi. 12. We have here another example of St. Luke's accuracy as to Roman matters. The ruins of Philippi are very extensive, but present no striking feature except two gate-ways, which are considered to belong to the time of Claudius. Traces of an amphitheatre, theatre, or stadium—for it does not clearly appear which—are visible in the di-

likely to have many Jewish residents ; and, instead of a synagogue, the Jews only possessed an oratory (*προσευχή*) outside the city, by the side of one of the rivulets which gave the place its ancient name of "the Springs." Such a locality, too, would suit the itinerant traders, who came with their mules to the market outside the city (for they were not allowed to pass the walls) to carry to the Thracian clans of Pangæus and Hæmus the dyed stuffs which were imported from Asia Minor ; and to supply their wants an establishment had been formed by "a certain woman named LYDIA, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira." She was a Jewish proselyte,⁴⁴ and was wont to resort with other women to the oratory. To this humble congregation, Paul and his companions, going out of the city on the Sabbath day, made known the Gospel for the first time in Europe, with a result equally remarkable for the absence of all ostentation :—"The Lord *opened the heart* of Lydia, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." By her baptism, *with her household*, Lydia gave the first recorded example of that great character which Christianity shares with Judaism, as a *family religion* ; and she followed it up with the first great example of Christian hospitality, constraining the Apostolic band to become her guests during their stay in Philippi.⁴⁵

§ 6. This quiet beginning was succeeded by an open conflict, which throws a flood of light on the real state of heathenism at this time. The ancient faith in the deities of Olympus and the Capitol, long all but extinct throughout the Greek and Roman world, had given place to a mixture of philosophic scepticism and credulous superstition ; nor were there wanting speculators, who made gain of the desire to pry into the future by the arts of divination. These pretensions were doubtless generally sheer imposture ; but unless we would charge back a similar imposture upon Paul himself, we must take his solemn adjuration to imply the reality of demoniacal possession in the case before us.⁴⁶ But it must be carefully

rection of the hills on the N.E. side. Inscriptions are found both in the Latin and Greek languages, but more generally in the former.

⁴⁴ Acts xvi. 14 : *σεβομένην τὸν Θεόν*. Lydia seems clearly to be a proper name, though Thyatira was in the district anciently called Lydia.

⁴⁵ Acts xvi. 13-15, 40. The peculiar extension of meaning belonging to the Greek *οἶκος* (like the Latin

familia) leaves a doubt whether those baptized with Lydia were her children, slaves, or work-people, or all these.

⁴⁶ Acts xvi. 18. Of course the same argument applies to St. Luke's statement of the consequent *fact*, "the spirit *came out* the same hour." The general subject of demoniacal possession has already been discussed. See chap. viii. § 12.

observed that the question, whether a soul intellectually and morally abandoned to disorder was suffered to fall under the power of a personal evil spirit, is quite distinct from the claims of supernatural knowledge and prophecy of which the possessed were chosen as the agents. Indeed the reality of the possession sets in a more striking light the vileness of the imposture which trafficked in the worst evil that could befall humanity. In short, the Apostle was now encountered at once by the malice of the unseen world⁴⁷ and the cupidity of this.

Among the seats of ancient superstition, Thrace had been conspicuous from time immemorial for the enthusiastic orgies of the Bacchic and Orphic worship; and the Mænads, who scattered the limbs of Pentheus over Hæmus, and threw the head of Orpheus upon the Hebrus with the name of Eurydice still trembling on his tongue, had their successors in a race of "sacred slaves," who served as attendants upon the oracle of Dionysus on Mount Pangæus. One of these, perhaps hired from the priests, or some other poor wretch possessed with a spirit which was supposed to inspire oracles like those uttered by the Pythoness at Delphi,⁴⁸ drove a gainful trade for her masters in the oracles which she vended, probably to the wild natives who frequented the market outside the city walls. As Paul and his companions went out to the place of prayer, the slave girl followed them with the continued cry—"These men are servants of the Most High God, which shew unto us the way of salvation." Some suppose that her cries were a scornful mimicry of the proclamation of the Gospel by Paul himself. At all events we may be sure that they were uttered in the same spirit as that of the devils who confessed Christ, and whom he suffered not to speak. Thus also Paul, after the scene had been repeated for many days, with his patience exhausted⁴⁹ turned round and proved the truth of her confession by bidding the spirit *in the name of Jesus Christ* to come out of her: and it came out the same hour.⁵⁰

Enraged at the destruction of their "property," and sup-

⁴⁷ Comp. Ephes. vi. 12: "Our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the world-rulers of the darkness of this age, against the spirit of wickedness among the heavenly beings."

⁴⁸ Acts xvi. 16: πνεῦμα φύθωνος, a spirit of python. The mephitic vapors of the cavern, in which the remains of the monster-serpent (python)

slain by Apollo rotted (φύθω = to rot), were the supposed medium of Delphic inspiration. *Pytho* was the ancient name of the city and oracle in Phocis, which was called *Delphi* from the tribe who became its possessors.

⁴⁹ διαπονηθείς, ver. 18.

⁵⁰ Acts xvi. 16-18. The ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας is an indication of the length of Paul's stay at Philippi.

ported doubtless by a tumultuous mob of those who were wont to receive the oracles, the masters of the slave-girl seized Paul and Silas, and dragged them before the local magistrates, the *duumviri*—or *prætors*, as the judges of a *colonia* preferred to be called—sitting in the forum.⁶¹ Well aware that they had no claim for the loss incurred through the Apostle's exorcism, they preferred the charge—to which the responsibility of local magistrates was peculiarly sensitive—that these Jews raised a tumult in the city, and taught customs unlawful for Romans to adopt. The clamor of the multitude stood in place of evidence and deliberation; and the alarmed magistrates, with a haste probably usual in their dealings with the wild frequenters of the outer market, tore off the prisoners' clothes, and ordered them to be beaten with rods.⁶² Then, bleeding from a Roman scourging of unusual severity,⁶³ they were delivered to the jailer with a charge to keep them safe; and the brutal officer thrust them into the inner prison, a dungeon of which the Tullianum at Rome may give us some idea, adding the torture of making their feet fast in the *stocks*.⁶⁴ Over this "suffering, and shameful treatment," which Paul afterward recalls as inflicted upon him at Philippi,⁶⁵ the spirit of Christian fortitude arose to cheerfulness. The midnight silence of the prison, usually disturbed only by groans and curses, was this night broken by the loud hymns in which Paul and Silas uttered their prayers and praises to God;⁶⁶ and the prisoners were listening to the sound, when a great earthquake shook the very foundations of the prison, all the doors suddenly flew open, and all bonds were loosed.⁶⁷

Roused from his sleep, and seeing the open doors, the jailer thought the prisoners had escaped, and drew his sword to

⁶¹ The plain meaning of the narrative seems to be that the *ἀρχοντες* (v. 19) and the *στρατηγοί* (v. 20) were the same officers; the former being a generic term, answering to *magistrates*, and the latter the specific title of the *prætors* (or *duumviri*). It is remarkable that nothing is said of Timothy or Luke, though the first person has just been used,—“as we went to prayer”—“the same followed Paul and us.” Paul and Silas were doubtless regarded as the chief speakers and actors.

⁶² The whole transaction seems to have passed so rapidly that Paul had

no time to plead his citizenship, of which the authorities first heard the next day.

⁶³ Πολλάς τε ἐπιθέντες αὐτοῖς πληγὰς, ver. 23.

⁶⁴ The *ξύλον* or *nervus* was a bar of wood or iron, to which the feet were bound, and which could be converted into an aggravated torture, at the will of the jailer, by drawing the legs far apart. The torment of such a posture was of course the more intolerable from the previous scourging.

⁶⁵ 1 Thess. ii. 2.

⁶⁶ προσευχόμενοι ἕμνουν τὸν Θεόν, ver. 25.

⁶⁷ Comp. Acts v. 19, xii. 6-10.

kill himself, when Paul cried to him with a loud voice, "Do thyself no harm : for we are all here." Calling for a light, he sprang into the dungeon, and in a state of overwhelming awe he fell down at the feet of Paul and Silas, and as soon as he had brought them out, put the question, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" The trembling eagerness of the inquirer, and the nature of the reply, concur with the spiritual instinct which has so often since repeated the same words, to prove that they were uttered in no sense short of the alarm of an awakened sinner for the safety of his soul; and the answer has ever since formed the brief but complete summary of the Gospel,—"**BELIEVE IN THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED :**"—nor let it be forgotten that this, perhaps the most pointed of all the proclamations of the way of salvation, adds the words which extend the blessing to the family of the believer—"**AND THY HOUSE.**" Not, however, that this simple phrase was to operate like some magic formula, or to be accepted as the shibboleth of a faith. It was but the text of a fuller exposition of Christian truth, by which both the jailer and his family were led to saving faith; for "they spake unto him the word of God, and to *all those in his house*;" and with this agrees the ensuing record of their common baptism and their common faith.⁵⁸ The change that had come over the spirit of the jailer was attested by the tender care with which he washed the prisoners' stripes, brought them into his own house, and set food before them.⁵⁹

Whether the magistrates were terrified by the earthquake, or ashamed of their hasty violence, or simply indifferent to the injustice by which they had appeased the tumult, they thought to end the matter by the order, sent to the prison by the lictors, as soon as it was day, "Let those men go." With joyful haste the jailer told the order to Paul and Silas, and bade them go in peace. But the great preacher of righteousness felt it his duty to vindicate the rights that had been outraged in his person and his companion's, who seems, like himself, to have been a Roman citizen.⁶⁰ Cicero had long since proclaimed the magic charm of that appeal, *Civis Romanus sum*, which many in the uttermost parts of the earth had found their help and their salvation, even among barbarians;⁶¹ and the same great voice had declared the maxim which has passed into a

⁵⁸ "And he was baptized, *he and all his straightway*"—"and he rejoiced, *believing in God with all his house.*"

⁵⁹ Acts xvi. 25-34.

⁶⁰ The argument from the plural *Romans* (v. 37, 38) is corroborated by the Roman name Silvanus.

⁶¹ Cic. in *Verr.* v. 57.

proverb :—"To bind a Roman citizen is an outrage, to scourge him is a crime." But to this had been added the extremes of indignity and injustice:—"They have beaten us *openly, uncondemned*"—said Paul—"being Romans, and have cast us into prison, and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." These are not the words of bravado and self-importance; but, the first time that the Apostle came into contact with the Roman government, he set the great example of Christian political principle, by vindicating the Roman constitution, and teaching magistrates their responsibility. They, terrified by the message brought back by the lictors—for Claudius watched vigilantly over the administration of the provinces—came to the prison to entreat Paul and Silas to be satisfied and to depart from the city.

Having first returned to the house of Lydia, and exhorted the brethren, Paul and Silas went on their way through Macedonia, leaving Luke, and apparently Timothy also, to build up the newly-founded church, with the aid doubtless of presbyters, and of those Christian women, the original companions of Lydia at the oratory, whose labors with him in the Gospel Paul records in his Epistle to the church.⁶² In that Epistle too we have proofs of the tender affection and generous feeling which bound together Paul and his Philippian converts, from this day to his imprisonment at Rome. Addressed by him as "my brethren, dearly beloved, and longed for,"⁶³ the cause of thankfulness to God at every remembrance of them,⁶⁴ they gave practical proofs of their attachment by sending aid to him more than once as early as his residence at Thessalonica, following him with it when he left Macedonia,⁶⁵ and by their continued fellowship in the Gospel and their aid to Paul in its defense and confirmation, down to the time of his imprisonment, giving him full confidence that "He who had begun the good work in them would perform it to the day of Jesus Christ."⁶⁶

Nor must we omit to notice the manifest order of progression in the cases of conversion recorded in this memorable chapter of the Acts.⁶⁷ Timothy, the gentle son of a godly mother, is insensibly trained to piety by early instruction in the Scriptures. Lydia, the devout proselyte, no sooner hears the truth from the lips of Paul, than her heart is opened to receive it. The jailer of Philippi, an ignorant and hard-

⁶² Phil. iv. 2.⁶³ Phil. iv. 1.⁶⁴ Phil. i. 3.⁶⁵ Phil. iv. 15, 16.⁶⁶ Phil. i. 8-8.⁶⁷ Acts xvi.

hearted heathen, struck by the terror of sudden conviction, utters the agonizing cry, *What must I do to be saved?* But all are united at Philippi in the fellowship of one faith and baptism.

§ 7. Passing through Amphipolis and Apollonia, scenes which would recall to the mind of Paul some of the most famous events of Grecian history, and crossing the base of the Chalcidic peninsula, the Apostle arrived with Silas at THESSALONICA, at the head of the Thermaic Gulf.⁶⁸ Lying directly in their route, as the chief station on the Egnatian road, and not only important as the Roman capital of Macedonia, but as a commercial city second only to Athens and Corinth, Thessalonica was further suited to be a centre of Christianity by possessing a synagogue of the Jews, who were attracted to it by its trade.⁶⁹ Paul, according to his custom, went into the synagogue on three successive Sabbaths, and reasoned with the Jews out of the Scriptures; the substance of his argument being the same as that of the Lord himself on the way to Emmaus, "that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ." His preaching made numerous converts among the Greek proselytes, and among the women of high station.⁷⁰ This success, as at Antioch in Pisidia, roused the envy of the unbelieving Jews, who easily raised a tumult among the vagabonds and idlers in the market of this great port.⁷¹ The mob attacked the house of Jason (probably a Hellenist, with whom Paul and Silas were staying), intending to bring them forth to the vengeance of the people; but, not finding them there, they dragged Jason and certain brethren before the *politarchs*, for such was the title of the magistrates of Thessalonica, which ranked as a free city (*libera civitas*), but not a colony.^{71b} To the general outcry, that Jason had received "these men who have come hither

⁶⁸ See *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

⁶⁹ Acts xvii. 1. The Jews have ever since had a prominent place in the annals of the city. They are mentioned in the 7th century during the Slavonic wars; and again in the 12th by Eustathius and Benjamin of Tudela. In the 15th century there was a great influx of Spanish Jews. At the present day the numbers of residents in the Jewish quarter are estimated at 10,000 or 20,000, out of an aggregate population of 60,000 or 70,000.

⁷⁰ Acts xvii. 2-4.

⁷¹ τῶν ἀγοραίων τινὲς ἀνδρας πονηροὺς.

^{71b} Again we find St. Luke's accuracy confirmed by an inscription found at Thessalonica, in which not only are the *Politarchs* mentioned by name, but several of their names are identical with those that occur in Paul's Epistles, as Sopater, Lucius, Pontius, Secundus, Publius, Demas, Gaius. (Böckh, *C. I.*, No. 1967; Lewin, *Fast. Sac.*, A.D. 51. No. 1-6-7.)

also,⁷² *turning the world upside down*”—and well it needed such a restoration of the order which sin had long since inverted—they added the specific charge which so strongly appealed to the fears of a Roman magistrate:—“And all these do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar, saying that *there is another king, JESUS.*” Though sharing in the general agitation, the magistrates did not, like the prætors of Philippi, forget their judicial character. They were content to take security of Jason and the rest; and the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night to Berea. The length of Paul's stay at Thessalonica is indicated by the fact already noticed, that the Philippians sent twice to relieve his necessities.

The two *Epistles to the Thessalonians*, which were written very soon after the Apostle's visit, add most important particulars of his work in founding that church. He speaks to the Thessalonian Christians as being mostly Gentiles; and reminds them that they had turned from idols to serve the living and true God and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, “Jesus who delivers us from the coming wrath.”⁷³ The Apostle had evidently spoken much of the coming and presence of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of that wrath which was already descending upon the Jews.⁷⁴ His message had had a wonderful power among them, because they had known it to be really the word of God who also wrought in them; a conviction aided by the zeal and disinterestedness and affection with which St. Paul (notwithstanding his recent shameful treatment at Philippi) proclaimed his Gospel among them.⁷⁵ He had purposely wrought with his own hands, even night and day, that his disinterestedness might be more apparent;⁷⁶ and he exhorted them not to be drawn away from patient industry by the hopes of the kingdom into which they were called; but to work quietly, and to cultivate purity and brotherly love.⁷⁷ Connecting these allusions with the preaching in the synagogue, we see clearly how the teaching of St. Paul turned upon the person of Jesus Christ as the Son of the Living God, prophesied of in the Scriptures, suffering and dying, raised up and exalted to a kingdom, and about to appear as the giver of light and life, to the destruction of his enemies and the saving of those who trusted in him.

⁷² This phrase seems to contain an allusion to what had passed at Philippi.

⁷³ 1 Thess. i. 9, 10.

⁷⁴ 1 Thess. ii. 16, 19, etc.

⁷⁵ 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8-13.

⁷⁶ 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8

⁷⁷ 1 Thess. iv. 3, 9, 11.

But the same Epistle proves that, almost immediately after his departure, the expectations which he had taught them to entertain of the appearing and presence of the Lord Jesus Christ had already undergone some corruption. There were symptoms in the Thessalonian church of a restlessness which speculated on the times and seasons of the future, and found present duties flat and unimportant. This evil tendency St. Paul seeks to correct, by reviving the first spirit of faith and hope and mutual fellowship, and by setting forth the appearing of Jesus Christ—not indeed as distant, but as the full shining of a day of which all believers in Christ were already children. But the very language by which he sought to correct the error was perversely pleaded in its support, and self-constituted interpreters of prophecy did not scruple to add forged letters in his name to their pretended revelations by the Holy Spirit. Through these devices, the Thessalonians had been disturbed by announcements that those convulsions of the world, which all Christians were taught to associate with the coming of Christ, were immediately impending. This was the occasion of St. Paul's *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, written, like the *First*, during his residence at Corinth, which throws new light upon his teaching while he was in the city. The words, "Remember ye not that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things," refer to that prediction, so much more explicit than is Paul's usual habit, of the great Apostasy and the revelation of the "Man of Sin," which must precede "the day of Jesus Christ."⁷⁸

§ 8. BEREÆA,⁷⁹ whither Paul and Silas retreated from Thessalonica, appears also to have had a large number of Jews, who proved themselves to be of a nobler spirit⁸⁰ than those of Thessalonica, by that conduct which has made them ever since a pattern of honest and earnest religious inquiry, the very course which Christ had in vain urged upon his hearers at Jerusalem.⁸¹ Paul and Silas went into their synagogue; and often as the Apostle's ministry had been thus opened, often as he had reasoned out of the Scriptures concerning Christ, this is the first time that we find his Jewish hearers

⁷⁸ 2 Thess. ii. 1-5.

⁷⁹ Now *Verria* or *Kara-Verria*. Occupying an elevated site on the eastern slope of Olympus, with an abundant supply of water, and commanding a wide view over the plain of the Axios and Haliacmon, it is regarded as one of the most agreeable towns in Rumili, and has now 15,000 or 20,000

inhabitants. A few ancient remains, Greek, Roman and Byzantine, still exist here.

⁸⁰ εὐγενέστεροι. May the difference be partly accounted for by the Berean Jews being less engrossed in trade than those of the port of Thessalonica?

⁸¹ John v. 39.

calmly testing the truth of his teaching,—“They received the word with all readiness of mind, and *searched the Scriptures daily*, whether those things were so. *Therefore*”—as the natural consequence—“many of them believed,” with not a few Greeks, among whom we again find women of distinction.”⁸² This the Thessalonian Jews no sooner heard, than they completed the parallel to those of the Pisidian Antioch by pursuing the Apostles to Berea, and stirring up the people; and a tumult was only avoided by Paul's departure for the coast, probably at Dium, whence he set sail for Athens. The haste and secrecy of the movement is seen in his leaving behind Silas and Timothy (who had rejoined him either at Thessalonica or Berea), and sending back word to them, by the brethren who had escorted him to Athens, to join him with all speed.”⁸³ We can hardly fail to see that the Apostle was urged on to the great work now before him by a Providence that overruled his plans; for he tells the Thessalonians that once and again, when he desired to revisit them, Satan hindered him: but Satan little knew the blow he aimed at his own kingdom, when his persecution drove Paul to Athens.”⁸⁴

That the Apostle had no deliberate purpose of going to Athens seems clear from the statement that the brethren at Berea sent him away *to go to the sea*; and then his conductors, guided no doubt by circumstances, such as what vessels happened to be sailing, brought him to Athens. The distinctive *divine call* which appointed him the Apostle of the Gentiles is made all the clearer from the slowness, not to say reluctance, with which he is urged on from Jerusalem to Cilicia and Syria, from Asia Minor to Europe, from the Jewish settlements in Macedonia to Athens and Corinth, as if the voice were repeated at every step, “*Depart! for I will send thee far hence* unto the Gentiles.” Paul was no rash adventurer, rushing forward in his own strength to the conflict with Greek philosophy and Roman force.

§ 9. Even when he found himself at Athens, Paul showed no haste to enter upon the work, but waited till he should be joined by Silas and Timotheus.”⁸⁵ There was nothing outwardly to distinguish him from any other Hellenistic Jew, as—to

⁸² Acts xvii. 10-13. The *daily* searching of the Scriptures seems to imply daily intercourse with Paul and Silas as their guides in the study.

⁸³ Paul gained from Berea another of the companions of his travels, Sopater the son of Pyrrhus, who return-

ed with him from Greece to Asia on his third missionary journey (Acts xx. 4). The fact of the navigation being open may perhaps indicate that the winter was now past.

⁸⁴ Acts xvii. 13-15.

⁸⁵ Acts xvii. 16.

use his own description of his occupation — he “walked through the city, and contemplated the objects of worship,”⁸⁶ with a spirit, taste and knowledge to appreciate those glorious works of Phidias and his successors, whose mutilated fragments we cherish as the choicest of our art treasures. But here, too, what things were gain to him he counted loss for Christ. Before we give a moment’s place to the thought that the Apostle disparaged the excellence of art, let us remember that the forms, which to us have lost their profane meaning with their pristine beauty, had then that beauty prostituted to the most degrading use. The very perfection of the art thus perverted would add to the keenness of Paul’s indignation at seeing such a city given to idolatry.⁸⁷ He could refrain no longer; and so, in addition to his usual discussions in the synagogue with the Jews and proselytes, he began to discourse every day in the Agora (the market-place) with all who frequented that public resort, like Socrates on the same spot five centuries before. The mutations which had brought down the city of Pericles from her political and martial glory had made no essential change in the character of the Athenian people. They were still the lively, keen-witted, impressible *Demus*, using the leisure of ancient freemen, to whom work was a degradation, in the open-air life of the Agora, lounging there in body, but in mind restlessly active and eager after every novelty: “For all the Athenians and strangers which were there spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some new thing.”⁸⁸

Here at length the utmost efforts of the highest human intellect, in search of that philosophy in the light of which man was to live and to die, were placed in direct contrast with the truths revealed by God to the chosen people. The Apostle proclaimed *Jesus and the Resurrection* as the means of conferring that spiritual life which the philosophers had given up in despair, taking refuge in the two great theories of the Porch and the Garden,—the triumph over the accidents of life by a proud independence, or the fruition of its blessings by using them before they perish. The philosophers of both schools encountered Paul with a mixture of curiosity and contempt. The *Epicurean*, teaching himself to seek for tranquil enjoyment as the chief object of life, heard of ONE claiming to be the Lord of men, who had shown them the glory of dying to

⁸⁶ Acts xvii. 23: Διερχόμενος γὰρ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ, θεωροῦντι καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν.

⁸⁷ Acts xvii. 16: παρωξύνετο τὸ ⁸⁸ Acts xvii. 21.

self, and had promised to those who fought the good fight bravely a nobler bliss than the comforts of life could yield. The *Stoic*, cultivating a stern and isolated moral independence, heard of ONE whose own righteousness was proved by submission to the Father in heaven, and who had promised to give his righteousness to those who trusted not in themselves but in him. To all, the announcement of a PERSON was much stranger than the publishing of any theories would have been. They would not concede to such a teacher the rank of a philosopher; but, while some despised him as a mere babbler (a *sower of words*),⁸⁹ others confounded him with the introducers of foreign superstitions and strange deities.⁹⁰ The fact that the first count in the indictment of Socrates was his not believing in the gods in whom the city believed, and introducing other new deities, has offered a coincidence too inviting to be neglected; and it has been supposed by some that St. Paul was arraigned on a similar charge before the court of Areopagus. But the narrative of St. Luke does not give any indication of a judicial process; and it seems clear that "they took him and brought him to the Hill of Ares" with the simple object expressed in their own words, "We wish to learn what these things mean."⁹¹ The result of Paul's contemptuous reception by the philosophers was that, instead of wasting his time in fruitless discussions with them in the Agora, he obtained a public audience of the people for the Gospel message.

§ 10. No locality of St. Paul's ministry is more deeply interesting or better known than this. The Agora of Athens lay in the deep valley enclosed between the Hill of the Muses (*Museum*) on the south, and the Pnyx, Areopagus and Acropolis, which curve round it on the north. The Areopagus directly overhangs the north side of the Agora; and a flight of sixteen steps, cut in the rock, leads up to the south-eastern summit of the rock, where the most venerable court held its sessions in

⁸⁹ σπερμολόγος.

⁹⁰ ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεύς, Acts xvii. 18. The *reason* added, "because he preached to them Jesus and the Resurrection," has been understood by some as implying that *Jesus* was taken for a god, and *Anastasis* for a goddess.

⁹¹ Acts xvii. 19, 20. We have here one of the most striking examples of the vacillation of our translators in cases of uncertainty. The Greek text has the same phrase both in ver. 19

and ver. 22, ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀρειὸν πάγον, and ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου, which must mean the same in both passages. But in the first we have "Areopagus" in the text, with "Mars' hill" in the margin, complicated by the note, "It was the highest court in Athens;" and conversely, in verse 22, we find "Mars' hill" in the text, with "the court of the Areopagites" in the margin. Mr. Lewin adheres to the view of a judicial process.

the open air. At the head of the staircase is a rock-hewn bench, forming three sides of a quadrangle; with two raised blocks,—the one on the eastern, the other on the western side,—the stations probably of the accuser and the accused. We may imagine the Apostle led up these steps and placed on one of the stones, whence, as from a pulpit, he might address the philosophers and distinguished persons who occupied the benches of the Areopagites, and the multitude on the steps and in the valley." Here, directly opposite to the great



Plan of Athens

1. Pryx Ecclēsia. 2. Theatrum. 3. Theatre of Dionysus.
4. Temple of the Olympian Jove.

gate-way (*Propylæa*) of the Acropolis, and the western front of the Parthenon,—at a time, be it remembered, when the Panathenaic procession was still wont to carry up to the Virgin goddess her mystic robe, while the thousand altars of the city smoked daily with the offerings of all the world,—a Jew for the first time taught the people of Athens, and the foreigners who flocked to the University of the World, what their own religion testified of the true God—though darkened and dishonored by idolatry—and thence led them up to the full knowledge of Him whom they ignorantly worshiped.

²² For further details, both of the locality and the court, see the *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Areopagus*. The court still existed at this time.

This "Sermon at Athens"—as it is commonly called—presents a new type of the Apostle's discourses, and an example of the fittest mode of approaching the minds and hearts of heathens in every age. Addressing an audience of cultivated Greeks, he no more insulted them by saying at the outset—"Ye are too superstitious," than he belied their conscience and philosophy by declaring them utterly ignorant of God. His real exordium was, "Athenians, I observe you to be in all things *eminently religious*." As an example of that tendency, which formed one chief spring of Hellenic vigor, to trace in every thing the hand of God, he singles out, from all those temples and shrines which he had been contemplating for several days,²³ an altar which bore the inscription TO GOD UNKNOWN.²⁴ Whether set up in a spirit like that of the ecclesiastical calendar, with its supplemental day for "All Saints," or whether connected with the esoteric worship of the mysteries, or whether meant to expiate some calamity for which all the known gods had been propitiated in vain, as tradition says of one of these altars (for we know from eye-witnesses that there were several of them at Athens),²⁵ the inscription confessed a truth to which Greek poetry and philosophy, nay, the whole voice of heathenism, bears continual witness. Beneath the veil of polytheism, we always find some idea of a God who is above all the deities of the Pantheon, from whom gods, men, and nature alike derive their being. The Apostle, therefore, had the fullest right to use that inscription as the

²³ τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν, Acts xvii. 23.

²⁴ Ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ. "The" is supplied by our translators, and the phrase, viewed as a title, admits of this sense, as well as of the indefinite article αὐτῷ, i. e., *some unknown God*. The verbal adjective, moreover, though often bearing the meaning given in our version, signifies literally *Unknowable*. Perhaps the spirit of the inscription may be given in the paraphrase: "To a Deity, who can not be recognized under the names or attributes of any of our gods."

²⁵ Paus. i. 4; Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* vi. 3, who cites these altars as an instance of the prudence of paying respect to all deities. As to the origin of these altars, Eichhorn suggests that they may have been built before the art of writing was known (βωμοὶ ἀνών-

υμοί), and subsequently inscribed ἀγν. θεῷ. Neander's view is based on a passage of Diog. Laertius, who, in his Life of Epimenides, says that in the time of a plague, when they knew not what god to propitiate in order to avert it, he caused black and white sheep to be let loose from the Areopagus, and, wherever they lay down, to be offered to the respective divinities (τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ), ὅθεν, adds Diogenes, ἐτί καὶ νῦν ἔστιν εὐρεῖν κατὰ τοὺς δήμους τῶν Ἀθ. βωμοὺς ἀνώνυμους. On which Neander remarks, that on this or similar occasions altars might be dedicated to an Unknown God, since they knew not what god was offended and required to be propitiated. But the story has a suspicious air of belonging to the class of inventions on the sole basis of the fact to be accounted for.

foreshadowing of the truths he had now to proclaim—
 “Whom therefore ye worship without knowing, Him declare I unto you.” The simple grandeur of this revelation stood in marked contrast to the vain speculations of the philosophers, and re-echoed the primal truth set forth “in the beginning” of both covenants:—“God, *that made the world, and all things that are therein*”—“the Lord of heaven and earth”—“HE giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth:”—while, in harmony with the key-note of the whole discourse, he appeals to their own poets, who had already borne witness to this truth, “FOR WE ARE ALSO HIS OFFSPRING.”⁹⁶

Nothing, however, could be more alien to the Apostle's argument than the inference that it mattered not how men worshiped this

“Father of all, in every age,
 In every clime adored,”

and that every form of service under every name was equally acceptable, whether

“By saint, by savage, or by sage,
 Jehovah, Jove, or Lord.”

From the universal fatherhood of God Paul deduces the folly of idolatry, as a degradation of that nature which man derives from God. If we are his offspring, made in *his likeness*, surely “we ought not to think that the Godhead (*τὸ θεῖον*) is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, on which a form is stamped by man's art and imagination.”⁹⁷ As for his dwelling-place, Paul dared to repeat the same truth, as he stood facing the Parthenon, which Solomon had proclaimed when he dedicated the Temple, that the Creator of the world, the Lord of heaven and earth, “*dwelleth not in temples made with hands*, neither is he served by men's hands as though he (the giver of all) needed any thing to be added to him.”⁹⁸ This ignorant worship belongs to the dispensation of his forbearance, during which the

⁹⁶ Acts xvii. 28: Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν. The particular quotation is from Aratus, the celebrated astronomical poet of Soli in Cilicia, and therefore the countryman of St. Paul; but the whole mythical poetry of the Greeks, from Homer and Hesiod downward, is full of passages which represent God (generally in the person of Jove) as the universal Father

and Creator. Perhaps the most striking is an anonymous verse quoted by Plutarch (*De Defect. Orac.* c. 48, p. 436):

Ζεὺς ἀρχή, Ζεὺς μέσσα, Δίος δ' ἐκ
 πάντα πέλονται.

⁹⁷ χαράγματι τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμηθήσεως ἀνθρώπου.

⁹⁸ Or, “had any further need of any one,” προσδεόμενός τινος.

vague efforts of the heathen world—"feeling after God, if haply they might find him, though he is not far from any one of us, for in him we live, and move, and have our being"—taught them the same lesson of their helplessness that the Law was designed to teach the Jews. But now the time of that forbearance is accomplished, and Paul amid the temples of Athens repeats to all the world the cry of the Baptist in the wilderness of Judæa—"God commandeth *all men everywhere* to repent." To enforce repentance, he declares that a *day* is appointed by God for the judgment of the world in righteousness—an idea not strange to Greek mythology; and thus he leads up their minds to the very essence of his message,—that this judgment would be administered by a MAN whom God had set apart, giving to all men a pledge that he had done so, by *raising him from the dead.*⁹⁹

But here the patience of his audience failed. With his wonted consummate prudence, Paul has not yet named the *name* against which rumors from the East had already prejudiced his hearers, —the Galilean peasant, who was, forsooth, to be exalted above Socrates and Plato, Zeno and Epicurus—*Christ crucified*, folly to the Greeks. But the mention of a resurrection was enough to provoke the scorn of the philosophers; and all revolted from the claim of personal allegiance to a *man* appointed to exercise the authority of the one God in the judgment of the world. Some mocked—a mode of debate in which the Athenians of all ages were adepts—others thought they had had enough of the subject for the time, and promised Paul another audience, which he never seems to have had, and so he departed from among them. The intellectual capital of the world was not marked for distinction in the annals of Christianity. No Epistle or visit records any further intercourse of Paul with Athens. But even here a few converts were gained; some of them, as elsewhere, among the most intelligent men and the women of distinction; classes represented by Dionysius the Areopagite,¹⁰⁰ and a woman named Damaris. These believers, if few in number, were

⁹⁹ It is well worth observing that Paul here opens the character of Christ as a *Judge* before speaking of him as a *Saviour*; the very same order which the Lord himself pursued in his first discourse to the unbelieving Jews, John v.

¹⁰⁰ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης. The article seems to imply that he was an eminent Athenian, and probably known by this title in the Church. Eusebius makes him, on the authority of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, to have been first bishop of Athens, where tradition places his martyrdom. Some spurious writings are extant under his name.

firmly attached to the Apostle.¹⁰¹ The narrative leaves it uncertain how long Paul stayed at Athens, and whether some persecution or danger did not cause him to depart without waiting for Silas and Timothy, who rejoined him at Corinth.¹⁰²

§ 11. CORINTH, which now ranked as the Roman capital of Greece, is conspicuous not only in Europe, but above every other city in the world—Jerusalem and Antioch scarcely excepted—in connection with the history and teaching and writings of St. Paul. It claims this distinction as the residence of the Apostle during his most critical contests, both with Jews and Greeks, in defense of the very essence of the Gospel; as the place whence he wrote his first apostolic letters—the two Epistles to the Thessalonians; as the Church to which he addressed those other two Epistles, which not only contain the fullest directions on matters of Christian faith and practice—the order of the Church, and the principles regulating her spiritual gifts and her Christian liberality, her ministry and her sacraments, the supreme law of Christian love, and the clearest statement of the doctrine of the resurrection,—but which reiterate, in terms unequalled in human language for simplicity and force, the one great central truth of the whole Gospel—JESUS CHRIST AND HIM CRUCIFIED.

There is, moreover, no scene of St. Paul's labors of which the local features are more clearly marked by allusions both in the Acts and the Epistles; and the course of the city's history will help to explain its choice to be the first chief home of Western Christianity. This ancient seat of the Æolian, and afterward of the Dorian race, stood just within that *Isth-*

¹⁰¹ Acts xvii. 34: *κολληθέντες αὐτῷ ἐπίστευσαν.*

¹⁰² Acts xviii. 1, 5. In 1 Thess. iii. 2, Paul, writing of his being hindered from visiting the Thessalonians, says, "Wherefore, when we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone, and sent Timothy . . . to establish you," etc.; and in ver. 6 he refers to the return of Timothy from this mission; and his report would naturally give occasion for the writing of this Epistle from Corinth. It has been inferred that Timothy joined Paul at Athens, and was sent back thence upon this mission, from which he returned again and rejoined Paul at Corinth. The absence of any mention of Silas in 1

Thess. iii. 2 does not exclude the supposition that he also may have come to Paul at Athens, and been sent on some similar mission, perhaps to Philippi; and that thus Paul was left alone at Athens. All this is confirmed by the message to join him *with all speed*. Nor need it be supposed, from Acts xviii. 5, that both returned together to him at Corinth. They may have arrived about the same time. (See Dr. Howson's note to chap. xi. vol. i. pp. 488-9, 4th ed.) Dr. Wordsworth infers, from 2 Cor. ix. 11 and Acts xviii. 5, that Timothy brought contributions to the support of the Apostle from the Macedonian churches, and thus released him from his continuous labor as a tent-maker.

mus or neck of land, the name of which has been transferred to every narrow passage between two seas; and this position enabled it to shut the only land route into the Peloponnesus, and to send forth its ships on both the seas which wash the eastern and western shores of Greece. Its command of the Isthmus was rendered perfect by that vast citadel of rock, the *Acrocorinthus*, which rises abruptly to a height of 2000 feet above the level of the sea, and the summit of which is so large as to have contained the original city, the Ephyra of Homer. The prospect from this eminence is one of the most celebrated in the world, embracing a panoramic view of the mountains of the Morea and the Corinthian Gulf, with the ranges that skirt its opposite shore, terminating in the snowy heights of Parnassus; while on the east, beyond the Saronic Gulf, dotted with its islands, the hills of Attica and the Acropolis of Athens are distinctly visible at a distance of 45 miles. Immediately below the Acrocorinthus, to the north, was the city of Corinth, on a table-land descending in terraces to the low plain which lies between Cenchreæ and Lechæum, the two harbors on the Saronic and Corinthian gulfs.¹⁰³ The eastern port invited the civilizing commerce of the Phœnicians, and from the western issued those earliest of Greek colonies, which the Corinthians founded on the Ionian Gulf, such as Ambracia, Corcyra (*Corfu*), and Apollonia; while Potidæa and other cities attest her colonizing energy in the Ægæan. The first trireme, or model Greek man-of-war, was said to have been built at Corinth, and the first naval battle on record was fought between her fleet and that of her own colony of Corcyra (about B.C. 664). The mythic fame of the Æolid race of Sisyphus was eclipsed in historic times by the tyrants Cypselus and Periander, under whom Corinth, enriched by commerce, became one of the earliest seats of Grecian art. As an aristocratic republic, Corinth yielded only to Sparta the supremacy of the Dorian confeder-

¹⁰³ Among the localities of Corinth, our special attention is demanded by the *Poseidonium*, or sanctuary of Neptune, the scene of those *Isthmian Games* from which St. Paul borrows some of the most striking imagery of his Epistles, and especially of those to the Corinthians. It stood at a short distance N.E. of Corinth, on a platform above a ravine, along the edge of which ran the fortifications of the Isthmus, here at its narrowest width. To the south of the temple may still be seen the "*stadium*," in which, says the Apostle, all the foot-racers run, but one receives the prize (1 Cor. ix. 24); and to the east those of the theatre, the probable scene of the pugilistic contest, the image of his own earnest fight with evil (ver. 26); and the coast is still fringed with the small green pine-trees that furnished for the victors that "corruptible crown," the symbol of the "incorruptible" promised to the Christian athlete who keeps his body under and brings it into subjection (ver. 25).

acy, and was often able to force on her hesitating leader—as, for example, into the Peloponnesian war. The Macedonian usurpers, after crushing the opposition of Athens, Thebes, and Sparta, treated Corinth, in whose citadel they placed a garrison, as the capital of Greece; and when Aratus had expelled the Macedonian garrison, the city became the head of the Achæan League (B.C. 243). In this character she drew down, by an insult to the ambassadors of Rome, that terrible destruction which Cicero describes as the extinction of the “Light of Greece” (B.C. 146). Excepting the temples and the buildings on the Acrocorinthus, the city lay in ruins for a century, till it was rebuilt by Julius Cæsar in B.C. 46, and the new *Colonia Julia Corinthus* was made the capital of the Roman province of Achaia and the residence of the proconsul. Rapidly recovering its ancient wealth, as a place of great commercial and manufacturing enterprise, it regained also its infamous celebrity as the most dissolute of Greek cities, and a chief seat of the worship of Aphrodite; while at the same time it was second only to Athens in intellectual activity.

Besides the native Greeks, the great number of Romans, as might have been expected in a colony so recently sent forth, is attested by the Latin names in the *Epistle to the Romans*, which St. Paul wrote from Corinth, during his second visit. The many Jewish residents, whom we always find in the Greek commercial cities, are indicated both by the narrative in the Acts, and by the Judaizing factions constantly referred to in the Epistles. Here then were gathered together all the elements on which the Apostle could most desire to act; and all of them in a state of vital activity, which formed a striking contrast to the “strenuous idleness” of Athens amid her old intellectual traditions. It was in places of living activity that St. Paul labored longest and most effectually, as formerly at Antioch, now at Corinth, and afterward at Ephesus.

§ 12. While at Corinth, as before at Athens, Paul was waiting for the arrival of Silas and Timotheus, he gained unexpected fellow-laborers in AQUILA, a Jew of Pontus,¹⁰⁴ and his wife PRISCILLA, who had lately arrived from Italy, in consequence of the edict of Claudius, expelling all Jews from Rome.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ It is noteworthy that Aquila, the Greek translator of the O. T., was also a native of Pontus; but it seems only a coincidence that *Aquila* was a family name of the *Gens Pontia* at Rome.

¹⁰⁵ Acts xviii. 2. Comp. Suet.

Claud. 25: “Jndæos, impulsore Chresto assiduo tumultuantes, Roma expulit;”—language which seems to imply that Christianity had already reached Rome, and excited the alarm of an emperor peculiarly hostile to “foreign superstitions.” Whether

Finding them already established at Corinth in the same handicraft as his own—the making of Cilician or hair-cloth tents—Paul took up his abode and wrought with them, and we may imagine his converse during the hours of labor with these who soon became, to use his own affectionate phrase, “his helpers in Christ Jesus.”¹⁰⁶ Having thus lived together during the eighteen months of Paul’s stay at Corinth, they shared his voyage to Ephesus.¹⁰⁷ Here they remained (while Paul went on to Jerusalem and Antioch) and instructed Apollos in the truth. Besides this intimate converse both with Paul and with Apollos, Aquila and Priscilla have the high distinction of affording a home to Christian churches in their house at Ephesus, and again at Rome when they were able to return thither.¹⁰⁸ To crown their eminence, they earned the thanks, not of Paul only, but of all the churches of the Gentiles, by incurring the risk of martyrdom to save his life; we know not upon what occasion; perhaps it was at Ephesus.¹⁰⁹

The labors of the Apostle at his craft of tent-making, with Aquila and Priscilla, are the most interesting if we admit the

Aquila and Priscilla were already Christians, or whether they were converted by St. Paul, is a question still in dispute, and which scarcely seems capable of solution. The argument that Aquila is not called μαθητής (like Timothy in Acts xvi. 1) is too minute to be decisive. We have here an independent evidence of the date of Paul’s arrival at Corinth. Edicts of this nature, for the expulsion of any class of foreigners from Rome, were almost always prompted by some disturbance in their native country. Now such an outbreak took place at Jerusalem, at the Feast of Tabernacles, A.D. 51, and led to the recall of Ventidius Cumanus, and the appointment of Felix as his successor. Allowing for the time required for the news to reach Rome, we may place the edict of Claudius at the beginning of A.D. 52, and the arrival of Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth about a month or six weeks later. If, then, Paul reached Corinth about February, A.D. 52, his departure (after 18 months) would fall about August, A.D. 53; and this inference is confirmed by his re-

lations, near the close of that period, with Gallio, whose arrival as pro-consul of Achaia may be placed, as Mr. Lewin has shown, about midsummer, A.D. 53. (*Fasti Sacri*, Introd. ch. viii. pp. 62-64.)

¹⁰⁶ Acts xviii. 2, 3: comp. Rom. xvi. 3.

¹⁰⁷ Acts xviii. 24.

¹⁰⁸ In the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, written from Ephesus during St. Paul’s third journey (A.D. 56 or 57), he sends a salutation from Aquila and Priscilla, “with the church that is in their house” (1 Cor. xvi. 19); and in that to the Romans, written from Corinth (A.D. 57 or 58), he greets Aquila and Priscilla, and “likewise the church that is in their house” (Rom. xv. 3-5). In this passage, as well as in the last greeting sent to them, probably at Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 19), the name of the wife is Prisca. There is a vague tradition that they suffered martyrdom by beheading.

¹⁰⁹ Rom. xvi. 4: οἱτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ταυτῶν τράχηλον ἠπείθηκαν.

supposition that this was the period of pressing want,¹¹⁰ from which he was relieved by the arrival of “the brethren” (Silas and Timotheus) from Macedonia with contributions, especially those of the Philippians.¹¹¹ This seasonable contribution aided him in his resolve to keep himself from being burdensome to the converts whom he was now about to gather from the Gentiles. It was not the proud assertion of personal independence that dictated this course; but reasons peculiar to his position among the corrupt Greeks of Corinth and Achaia. Nowhere does he insist so forcibly, as in writing to this very church, on the law that “no man goeth a warfare on his own charges”—that “the ox that treadeth out the corn must not be muzzled”—that “so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.”¹¹² He tells them plainly that his refraining from using this power was the only disadvantage they had in comparison with other churches;¹¹³ nay, with his fondness for bold expressions, he says, “I spoiled other churches, taking wages of them for my ministry among you.”¹¹⁴ It is in no spirit of sarcastic irony that he pleads—“forgive me this wrong”—for he calls God to witness that no want of love to them dictated this course, the motive for which he plainly adds:—“For what I do, I also will do, that I may cut off occasion from them that desire occasion [and challenge them to this proof]—wherein they boast, let them be found like us.”¹¹⁵ He foresaw that, among the innumerable pretenders who, in that rich and frivolous province, made a gain of religion, there would soon arise some to abuse the Christian name; those whom he afterward branded as “false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ,” even as Satan, whose ministers they were, transformed himself into an angel of light. These men even boasted of the contributions they exacted, as a proof of their superiority to the Apostle who would receive none.¹¹⁶ But he was content to suffer this apparent humiliation, and to take this for his sole reward—“That, when I preach the Gospel, I may make the Gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the

¹¹⁰ 2 Cor. xi. 9: *ὑπερπηθείς, ὑπέρημα*, literally, being at the last resource.

¹¹¹ This view of Dr. Howson (*St. Paul*, vol. i. ch. xi.) receives some confirmation from the fact that, from the very first of St. Paul's labors in Greece—“in the beginning of the Gospel, when I departed from Mace-

donia”—the Philippians (and they alone) “communicated with him as concerning giving and receiving” (Phil. iv. 15).

¹¹² 1 Cor. ix. 7-11.

¹¹³ 2 Cor. xii. 13.

¹¹⁴ 2 Cor. xi. 8.

¹¹⁵ 2 Cor. xi. 12, 13.

¹¹⁶ 2 Cor. xi. 21.

Gospel.”¹¹⁷ “Nevertheless, we have not used this power; but suffer all things, *lest we should hinder the Gospel of Christ.*”¹¹⁸ He resolved not to bring upon the Gospel the scorn of the selfish and quick-witted Greeks, not to sacrifice one iota of the witness which they were compelled to bear to his asseveration—“I seek not *yours* but *you*”¹¹⁹—“As the truth of Christ is in me,” so vehemently does he asseverate,—no man shall stop me of this boasting in all the region of Achaia.¹²⁰

§ 13. With such resolves, from his very first arrival at Corinth, did Paul work daily with Aquila and Priscilla. But, when the rest of the Sabbath came round, he went into the synagogue, according to his custom, and labored to persuade both the Jews and the Greeks who happened to be present.¹²¹ Some weeks passed thus, till the arrival of Silas and Timothy from Macedonia not only gave a new impulse to the Apostle, but marked a crisis in his career. Our abiding sense of the devotedness of St. Paul makes it hard to realize that he also was subject to fits of energy and depression, the latter being connected (it would seem) with that bodily infirmity, the “thorn in the flesh,” which buffeted him as a messenger of Satan. He tells the Corinthians that “he was with them in weakness, and fear, and much trembling;”¹²² and his adversaries were able, after his departure, to strike at his influence with the taunt:—“His letters are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible.”¹²³ But this constraint, in whatever it consisted, was now swallowed up in that “constraint of the word”¹²⁴—that overwhelming pressure of heart and conscience, binding his whole nature to his work amid all his infirmities, which St. Luke expresses by the very word used by the Lord himself—“I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I *straitened* till it be accomplished,”¹²⁵—which Paul himself describes in the most powerful language ever used by man to utter human motives:—“For the love of Christ *constraineth us*;¹²⁶ because we thus judge, that, if One died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.” This overwhelming sense that “Christ is all and in all,” this full meaning of the Gospel of Christ’s

¹¹⁷ 1 Cor. ix. 18.

¹¹⁸ 1 Cor. ix. 12.

¹¹⁹ 2 Cor. xii. 14.

¹²⁰ 2 Cor. xi. 10.

¹²¹ Acts xviii. 4.

¹²² 1 Cor. i. 3. ¹²³ 2 Cor. x. 10.

¹²⁴ Acts xviii. 5 : *συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ*
seems clearly the true reading, not τῷ
πνεύματι.

¹²⁵ Luke xii. 50 : *πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως
οὗ τελεσθῆναι*.

¹²⁶ 2 Cor. v. 14, 15 : *συνέχει ἡμᾶς*.

death and resurrection, seems to have come upon Paul's mind almost with the force of a new revelation, in the light of which he formed the resolution:—"I determined not to know any thing among you, save JESUS CHRIST AND HIM CRUCIFIED."¹²⁷ It had an equal influence on the manner as on the matter of his preaching. Paul knew that "Christ had sent him to preach the Gospel, not with wisdom of words, lest the *cross of Christ* should be made of none effect." All the arts of rhetoric and philosophic argument, the "excellency of speech and wisdom," the "enticing words of man's wisdom," were abjured by the very Apostle who was qualified to use them on the very field that invited and provoked their display, in order to give place to the "manifestation of spirit and of power," to prove that the simplicity of preaching was God's instrument for saving them that believe, and to assure the converts that "their faith was not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God." Great as was the temptation to gratify "the Jews who asked for a sign, and the Greeks who sought after wisdom," Paul now saw that any such concession would mar the whole simplicity of the Gospel, and he summed up the message of Christ's heralds in these words:—"BUT WE PREACH CHRIST CRUCIFIED, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, CHRIST THE POWER OF GOD, AND THE WISDOM OF GOD."¹²⁸

"WE"—the Apostles and Evangelists then—the ministers of the Gospel in every age—but, at Corinth in particular, Paul and the two associates whose aid he thus owns:—"The Son of God, even Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, *by me and Silvanus and Timotheus*, was in him *yea* and in him *Amen*, unto the glory of God by us."¹²⁹ The sense of having their help seems to have given that impulse which caused Paul to testify first to the Jews Jesus the Christ.¹³⁰ His new plainness provoked the same animosity as at every former step; and when, like those at Antioch in Pisidia, they opposed themselves and blasphemed, Paul shook his raiment, and said to them, in the words of their own prophet, "Your blood be upon your own heads! Pure from it, I will henceforth go to the Gentiles."¹³¹ From that day he forsook the synagogue, his first act of open separation from Judaism, but continued to meet his own flock close by, in the house of a

¹²⁷ 1 Cor. ii. 2.¹²⁸ 1 Cor. i. 23, 24, ii. 5.¹²⁹ 2 Cor. i. 20. ¹³⁰ Acts xviii. 5.¹³¹ Ezek. xxxiii. 4; Acts xviii. 6. 7.

There is no reason to believe that Paul transferred his *abode* from the house of Aquila and Priscilla to that of Justus.

proselyte named Justus. He was followed by Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, whose baptism, with his whole house, by the Apostle himself, formed an exception to Paul's usual practice, for "Christ"—he says—"sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel."¹³² The like exception was made in favor of Gaius, whose name stands recorded in Scripture as a great example of Christian hospitality;¹³³ as well as for the household of Stephanas, afterward described as "the first-fruits of Achaia, who had devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints."¹³⁴

The news of this division among the Jews, and of the Apostle's turning to the Gentiles, spread through the city; and many of the Corinthians believed and were baptized, probably by Silvanus and Timotheus. That this movement roused anew the extreme fury of the Jews, may be inferred from Paul's referring to their opposition with vehement indignation in his *First Epistle to the Thessalonians*, which was written from Corinth soon after the arrival of Silvanus and Timotheus:—"Who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men: forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway; for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost."¹³⁵ It was at this crisis that the Apostle was favored with another of those supernatural visions, which from the very day of his conversion had directed and cheered his course. The LORD, whom he had seen in the way to Damascus, now spoke to him in the night, and said to him, "Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for *I have much people in this city.*" Thus encouraged, he remained in Corinth, teaching the word of God, for a year and six months. During this time he kept up his intercourse with the churches of Macedonia; and the *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* was sent not long after the First, chiefly to correct the misapprehensions which some had founded upon the first, respecting the speedy approach of "the day of the Lord," Christ's second advent.¹³⁶

¹³² 1 Cor. i. 14-17.

¹³³ Rom. xvi, 23.

¹³⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 15-17. From the application of the same phrase, "the first-fruits of Achaia unto Christ," to Epænetus, Dr. Howson infers that Epænetus was probably of the household of Stephanas. May not Stephanas and his house have been the

first-fruits of the Jewish converts, and Epænetus of the Gentiles? It deserves notice how large a number of the Corinthian Christians are mentioned by name in St. Paul's Epistles.

¹³⁵ 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.

¹³⁶ Concerning the teaching of these Epistles, which has already been referred to in connection with the

These are the earliest of St. Paul's Epistles which have come down to us; though the salutation at the close of the Second Epistle seems to imply that the Apostle was already in habitual correspondence with the churches he had planted.¹³⁷ That salutation, moreover, supplies a fact of the greatest importance in connection with St. Paul's Epistles:—"The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle: so I write."¹³⁸ The habit of employing an amanuensis is so frequent that we need not speculate whether St. Paul adopted it on account of his "infirmity in the flesh." He used his own hand, partly to give that attestation to the genuineness of his Epistles which we find already not to have been superfluous,¹³⁹ partly to convey that sense of personal regard which we associate with a great man's autograph; and sometimes he adds to the salutation in his own hand statements to which he desires thus to give the greatest emphasis. We can scarcely doubt that the magnificent doxology which follows the salutation in the *Epistle to the Romans* was of this kind;¹⁴⁰ and Paul has given us an example beyond all doubt in the close of the *Epistle to the Galatians*. After dictating his unusually severe rebukes of the Judaizing teachers who had beguiled the unstable Gauls, he takes the pen into his own hand; but, before he adds the salutation, he uses it to record the final condemnation of their hollow motives, and the final assertion of that doctrine of the cross, to which this very

Church of Thessalonica, see further in the *Dict. of the Bible*, art. "THESSALONIANS, EPISTLES TO."

¹³⁷ The two Epistles to the Thessalonians alone belong to the present Missionary Journey. The Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Corinthians, were written during the next journey. Those to Philemon, the Colossians, the Ephesians, and the Philippians, belong to the captivity at Rome. With regard to the Pastoral Epistles, there are considerable difficulties, which require to be discussed separately. Since the publication of Paley's *Hæres Pauline*, important attempts have been made to estimate the Epistles of St. Paul more broadly, by considering them in their mutual order and relations, and in their bearing upon the question of the development of the writer's teaching. Such attempts must lead to a better

understanding of the Epistles themselves, and to a finer appreciation of the Apostle's nature and work. It is notorious that the order of the Epistles in the New Testament is not their real or chronological order. The mere placing of them in their true sequence throws considerable light upon the history; and, happily, the time of the composition of the more important Epistles can be stated with sufficient certainty.

¹³⁸ 2 Thess. iii. 17: comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18. Rom. xvi. 22 gives incidentally another example, in the mention of the name of the amanuensis:—"I, Tertius, who wrote this Epistle."

¹³⁹ 2 Thess. ii. 2. And the salutation itself follows immediately upon an emphatic claim of obedience to his word by this Epistle (iii. 14).

¹⁴⁰ Rom. xvii. 25-27.

form of reiteration adds new emphasis. Nay, more—and it is deeply interesting that such a personal trait of the Apostle has been preserved to us—he appeals to the large, bold handwriting, so characteristic of his fervid temperament, as a proof of the emphasis with which he wrote:—“See *in what large letters* I have written to you with mine own hand!”¹⁴¹ It was in those large characters that he traced the words, “God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ”—“In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.”¹⁴²

Two general remarks relating to St. Paul's Letters may find a place here. (1.) There is no reason to assume that the extant letters are all that the Apostle wrote. On the contrary, there is a strong presumption, and some slight positive evidence, that he wrote many which have not been preserved. (2.) We must be on our guard against concluding too much, from the contents and style of any Epistle, as to the fixed bent of the Apostle's whole mind at the time when it was written. We must remember that the Epistles to the Thessalonians were written while St. Paul was deeply absorbed in the peculiar circumstances of the Corinthian Church; and that the Epistles to the Corinthians were written *between* those to the Galatians and the Romans. These facts are sufficient to remind us of the *versatility* of the Apostle's mind;—to show us how thoroughly the feelings and ideas suggested to him by the circumstances upon which he was dwelling had the power to mould his utterances.

§ 14. At Corinth, as afterward at Ephesus, the residence of Paul gave occasion to one of those early outbreaks against Christianity at great seats of Greek civilization and Roman power, which portended future persecution. But the time had not yet come when the Gentiles surpassed the hostility of the Jews; and the present danger was averted by the wise and fair, if somewhat contemptuous, toleration of a philosophic governor. GALLIO,¹⁴³ the proconsul of Achaia under Claudius,

¹⁴¹ Gal. vi. 11: ἵδετε πηλίκους ὑμῶν γράμμασιν ἔγραψα τῇ ἑμῇ χειρὶ. The sense is altogether lost in the A.V. We can hardly fail to see, by way of contrast, an affecting allusion to the constraint under which he wrote, with his arm bound to that of the soldier who kept him, in the salutation to the Colossians (iv. 18):—“The salutation by the hand of me Paul. Remember my bonds.”

¹⁴² Gal. vi. 11-18.

¹⁴³ His full name, Junius Annæus Gallio, was derived from his adoption into the family of the rhetorician Lucius Junius Gallio. Gallio appears to have resigned the government of Achaia on account of the climate not agreeing with his health (Seneca, *Ep. civ.*); and we know that he was again at Rome in A.D. 54. The character of him which his brother gives is in

was the brother of the great Seneca, and, like him, imbued with learning from his infancy. When, therefore, the Jews brought Paul before his tribunal, on the charge of persuading men to worship God contrary to the law, Gallio stopped the case, just as Paul was opening his mouth to defend himself, declaring that he would be a judge of actual crimes, but not of doctrine, and *names*, and of their law. Natural indignation at this light treatment of the sacred *Name* has blinded many Christians to the excellence of Gallio's conduct as a magistrate, administering the traditional tolerant policy of Rome. But the "careless Gallio" stands in as honorable contrast to the Philippian duumvirs, as Festus does to the venal brother of Pallas. Even when he suffered the Corinthian spectators—whether they were favorable to St. Paul, or actuated only by anger against the Jews—to seize on Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, and to beat him before the tribunal, Gallio's calm indifference may have saved Corinth from one of those frightful tumults between Greeks and Jews which desolated such cities as Alexandria and Cæsarea.¹⁴⁴ The result of the tumult seems to have been favorable to the influence of Paul, who remained a good while at Corinth before he took his leave of the brethren and sailed for Syria.¹⁴⁵

accordance with that which we might infer from the narrative in the Acts: *Nemo mortalium mihi tam dulcis est, quam hic omnibus*: and again, *Gallionem fratrem meum, quem nemo non parum amat, etiam qui amare plus non potest*. And Statius says, *Hoc plus quam Senecam dedisse mundo, aut dulcem generasse Gallionem*. He is said to have been put to death by Nero, "as well as his brother Seneca, but not at the same time" (Winer); but there is apparently no authority for this. Tacitus describes him (*Ann.* xv. 73) as *fratris morte pavidum, et pro sua incolumitate supplicem*; and Jerome, in the Chronicle of Eusebius, says that he committed suicide in A.D. 65. Of Seneca's works, the *De Ira* is dedicated to Gallio.

¹⁴⁴ Acts xviii. 12-17. Some commentators give a different color to the whole transaction, supposing Sosthenes to be a Christian; but the language of St. Luke seems clearly to imply that Sosthenes was, at this time at least, a prime mover of the

Jewish tumult in his character of "chief ruler of the synagogue" (*ἀρχισυνάγωγος*), in which office he may have succeeded Crispus. If he is the same person mentioned as "Sosthenes our brother" (1 Cor. i. 1), he may have been converted at a later period, and have accompanied Paul to Ephesus, whence the Epistle was written. But the name was too common for much stress to be laid on the coincidence.

¹⁴⁵ Acts xviii. 18: *προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἱκανάς*. Mr. Lewin argues that the shaving of Paul's head at Cenchreae was a ceremony marking the termination of the vow, which we may suppose to have been made at the time of the Jews' assault upon him; and as a vow could not be made for less than a month, we may assume that the assault was made soon after Gallio's arrival, presuming on the untamed temper of the new proconsul, say in July, and that St. Paul's departure was in August, in time to reach Jerusalem for the Feast of

§ 15. The Apostle was accompanied by Aquila and Priscilla on his departure from Cenchreæ, the eastern harbor of Corinth, which lay on the Saronic Gulf.¹⁴⁶ But before they sailed, a ceremony was performed which has given rise to much controversy. The impression on the reader's mind is that Paul himself shaved his head at Cenchreæ, because he had a vow; but eminent commentators hold the view, which is at least equally consistent with the grammatical order of the passage, that the ceremony was performed by Aquila.¹⁴⁷ In either case we see the Apostle—as on a subsequent occasion¹⁴⁸—sanctioning if not practicing customs which proved that he was in no eager haste to cut himself off from conformity with his Jewish brethren in things indifferent. The question, whether his conduct in these two cases furnishes an example to Christians in support of the practice of vows, is too much a matter of casuistry to be discussed here.

The Apostle's destination was Jerusalem; but the ship in which he sailed followed the most common route across the Ægæan from Corinth to Ephesus. "These were the capitals of the two flourishing and peaceful provinces of Achaia and

Tabernacles, A.D. 53. As to the other view, which regards this Feast as the Pentecost of A.D. 54, there is nothing in the narrative that forbids our giving a wider extent both to the period between Gallio's arrival and the tumult, and to the *ἡμέρας ἱκανάς* after the latter event; but we may well believe that Paul would not presume long on the protection of the proconsul against a new outbreak. As to the time required for the voyage, Mr. Lewin observes that in A.D. 58 Paul sailed from *Philippi* at the close of the Passover, and reached Jerusalem before Pentecost, having consumed 44 days on his way. But as he now sailed from Corinth direct for Jerusalem, the space between the beginning of August and September 16 (the Feast of Tabernacles this year) would be sufficient.

¹⁴⁶ The town, of which the insignificant ruins retain the ancient name in the form of *Kikri*, was a place of considerable importance, being the emporium for the trade of Corinth with the East, as *Lechæum*, on the Corinthian Gulf, was with Italy and

the West. Cenchreæ was 70 stadia (between 8 and 9 miles) from Corinth, by a road the sides of which were lined with tombs and a grove of cypresses. At the time of St. Paul's Third Missionary Journey, Cenchreæ had a church, the deaconess of which, Phœbe, is named in the *Epistle to the Romans* (xvi. 1).

¹⁴⁷ Acts xviii. 18. The latter view, held by Grotius, has been defended by Dr. Howson (vol. ii. c. xii.), whose arguments are replied to by Dean Alford (N. T. in *loc.*). Vows were often taken, in form akin to that of the Nazarite, but of temporary obligation. Not the least hint is given as to the object of the present vow; unless we connect it with Paul's haste to reach Jerusalem in time for the approaching feast (ver. 21); for Josephus mentions a vow which included the cutting off the hair, and the beginning of an abstinence from wine 30 days before offering a sacrifice. For the discussion of the subject, see *Dict. of the Bible*, art. NAZARITE, vol. ii. p. 472.

¹⁴⁸ Acts xxi. 24.

Asia, and the two great mercantile towns on the opposite sides of the sea. If resemblances may be suggested between the ocean and the Mediterranean, and between ancient and modern times, we may say that the relation of these cities of the Eastern and Western Greeks to each other was like that of New York and Liverpool. Even the time taken up by the voyage constitutes a point of resemblance. Cicero says that, on his eastward passage, which was considered a long one, he spent fifteen days, and that his return was accomplished in thirteen."¹⁴⁹ Either the ship was bound further for Syria, or Paul found another vessel on the point of sailing, so that he only made a few days' stay at the city to which we shall presently return as a chief place of his abode. But in this short interval, and doubtless on the Sabbath, he went into the synagogue, and reasoned with the Jews. They gave an earnest of that readiness which they soon after showed to hear the Word, by entreating Paul to remain some time with them; but, bent as he was on keeping the approaching feast at Jerusalem, he bade them farewell, with the promise, soon so amply redeemed, "I will return again unto you, if God will." It was no small consolation for his departure, that Aquila and Priscilla remained behind, apparently at Paul's express desire.¹⁵⁰ Their house became the home of the infant church of Ephesus, and themselves the instructors of Apollos.

§ 16. Meanwhile, Paul pursued his voyage to Cæsarea; and, landing there, went up to Jerusalem, as he had proposed. That this visit was but hasty, seems indicated by the brevity of the record:—"And when he had landed at Cæsarea, and gone up and saluted the church, he went down to Antioch."¹⁵¹ But the Apostle's eagerness to pay the visit may assure us of its great importance, which we can understand in the light of his past and approaching career. His salutation to the Jewish Christians, assembled at the feast, would include a full account of the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles in Roman colonies and Greek capitals; and the report, while gladdening the sincere believers, and confirming their faith in the full salvation of the Gentiles, would provoke new suspicion and hostility from the Judaizers. Foreseeing, we may feel sure, his great coming conflict with these "false brethren unawares crept in," he would attach more importance than ever to a full understanding and hearty loving union with James and the true Christians at Jerusalem. And, while they learn-

¹⁴⁹ Conybeare and Howson, vol. i. c. xii.

¹⁵⁰ Acts xviii. 19 : *κακείνους κατέλι-
πεν αὐτοῦ.*

¹⁵¹ Acts xviii. 22.

ed to appreciate his work, what he saw upon this visit would quicken his desire to cement that union by the means on which he ever insists, "the fellowship of giving and receiving," and to fulfill the old injunction with which his brother Apostles had sent him forth to the Gentiles:—"Only they would that we should *remember the poor*, the same which I also was forward to do."¹⁵² For Judæa was now being ground down to those extremities which soon provoked the great rebellion; and Felix, who had arrived as the successor of Ventidius Cumanus about midsummer, A.D. 53 had entered on his course of servile despotism and rapacity.¹⁵³

From this visit the Apostle went forth to oppose every art by which the Judaizers tried to rob the Gentiles of their Christian liberty, but to insist no less earnestly on the duty of the Gentile converts to contribute of their wealth to their suffering Jewish brethren. The contributions made by Macedonia and Achaia for the poor of the saints in Jerusalem becomes a prominent object of his labors. He represents it as a debt due from the former to the latter: "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister to them in carnal things." And it was on the very service of carrying these contributions to Jerusalem, at the Pentecost four years later, that no remonstrances could deter him from risking his liberty and life.¹⁵⁴

The eagerness of the Apostle, on the latter occasion, to be at Jerusalem on the day of *Pentecost*, raises a presumption that this too was the "feast" which he was now so eager to keep at Jerusalem. (The Pentecost of A.D. 54 fell on May 31.) This festival, rather than the Passover, had now acquired the distinctive appellation of "*the feast*." It was that to which the greatest number of the Jews went up, after the full ingathering of the harvest; and at which, therefore, Paul would find the largest gathering of the brethren at Jerusalem. This view is supported by arguments derived from the season during which navigation was suspended, and the length of the voyage from Ephesus to Cæsarea.¹⁵⁵ On this view it would be in the early summer of A.D. 54 that Paul returned to Antioch,

¹⁵² Gal. ii. 10.

¹⁵³ See chap. v., pp. 120, 121.

¹⁵⁴ Rom. xv. 25-27; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; 2 Cor. viii. 1, ix. 2, 12; Acts xix. 21, xx. 3, 16, xxi. 4, 10-17.

¹⁵⁵ Wieseler, pp. 48-50. The course of a similar voyage is more particularly described on St. Paul's return

from his *Third Missionary Journey* (Acts xxi. 1-3). Dr. Howson observes that only very favorable weather would enable Paul to accomplish his purpose, and finds in the brevity of the visit to Jerusalem a hint that it was not reached in time for the feast.

for the last time, having completed his *Second Missionary Journey*. This epoch in the Apostle's life coincides nearly with one equally marked in civil history. It was on the 12th of October, A.D. 54, that the Emperor Claudius was murdered by his infamous consort Agrippina, and succeeded by the young NERO, a name equally hateful in the annals of the Church and of the world.

Mr. Lewin, however, arguing chiefly from the general tenor of the chronological data which have been noticed in the course of the narrative,—and especially from those affecting Paul's stay at Corinth,—holds this feast to have been the *Feast of Tabernacles* of A.D. 53, which fell on Sept. 16. The distinctive name of "the Feast" was certainly applied not only to the Pentecost, but also to the Feast of Tabernacles; which, falling at the conclusion of all the agricultural labors of the year, seems to have been as much frequented by the native Jews, the class whom Paul would be especially anxious to meet on this occasion. This hypothesis, moreover, by allowing us to place the commencement of Paul's Third Circuit at the very beginning of A.D. 54, seems to agree best with the dates of the Apostle's three years' residence at Ephesus.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) THE VISIT OF GALATIANS II.

THIS is the best place to examine the opinion maintained by Mr. Lewin, that the visit of Acts xviii, and not the mission to Jerusalem on the controversy about the circumcision of the Gentiles (Acts xv.), was the visit which Paul paid to Jerusalem fourteen years after that which ensued upon his conversion (Galatians ii. 1). Besides the chronological argument from the mode of computing the fourteen years and the preceding three years, Mr. Lewin relies on the object which, as above shown, this visit had

—to establish the unity of the Jewish and Gentile churches by exhibiting the harmony between the Apostles at Jerusalem and the Apostles to the Gentiles. This great purpose would be a worthy object of that "revelation" by which Paul tells us that he went up, and in which Mr. Lewin finds the motive of the assertion, "*I must by all means keep this feast that cometh at Jerusalem*" (Acts xviii. 21).

But these arguments seem by no means conclusive. After what was said above of the interview between Paul and Barnabas and the other Apostles, it seems only neces-

sary to observe, in one word, how the whole tone of the Apostle implies an earlier stage of his ministry (Gal. ii.). Is it possible that *after* the great settlement agreed to at Jerusalem had been confirmed by his successes in Galatia, Macedonia and Greece, he could have felt it necessary to "communicate the Gospel *privately* to them of reputation," or have felt any remnant of doubt "lest that by any means he should run or had run in vain?"—nay, is not the very idea of such *privacy* at this period of his career manifestly absurd? In truth, it seems easy to draw a clear and most important distinction between the Apostle's relation to the church at Jerusalem at these two periods of his career. On the former occasion he was beset by the new doubts raised by the Judaizers; and he had to bear the responsibility of the cause entrusted to him by the church of Antioch: "Without were fighting, and within were fears." But on the second journey he had gone forth as the bearer of the great decision made at Jerusalem, and he returned laden with fruits which that decision had aided him to reap in Macedonia and Greece, where the enforcement of the Mosaic Law would have been a fatal obstacle to success. *Then* his own mind needed a final confirmation in the principles of Christian liberty which he had adopted in dealing with the Gentiles; *now*, all that remained was to confirm the Jewish Christians in the same principles. All this shows the motive of his anxiety to revisit Jerusalem, but is quite inconsistent with the tone of *Galatians ii.*

The strongest and weakest points of Mr. Lewin's argument remain to be noticed. He connects the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem with the injunction laid by the Apostles at Jerusalem upon Paul and

Barnabas, "that we should remember the poor" (Galatians. ii. 11). Now it must be admitted that the Third Circuit is the earliest occasion on which we trace those systematic collections which so fully carried out this principle. But does it follow that the principle itself was only agreed upon at this time; nay, that it had not been acted upon before? The answer is at hand in the Apostle's comment, "The same which I also was forward to do." It was the principle of his whole career, and not of one stage of that career only. It had been anticipated by the church at Antioch in the relief sent to Jerusalem during the famine, and it now becomes more prominent than ever, because, from the causes already mentioned, the wants of the Jewish Christians become now more than ever pressing. But, moreover, this injunction was laid by the Apostles at Jerusalem upon *Paul and Barnabas*: Paul had gone up by revelation to Jerusalem *with Barnabas*, taking *Titus* with them; and it was to *Paul and Barnabas* that the Apostles gave the right hand of fellowship, that *they* should go to the Gentiles. Where is one word or hint of Barnabas being with Paul on this occasion?—or *Titus*, of whose companionship with Paul on the third journey we have distinct mention, but who never appears upon the second? Mr. Lewin's suggestion, that Paul might have taken up Barnabas on the voyage, at Cyprus, or that Barnabas may have joined him by appointment at Cæsarea, needs no refutation, as it has no basis in known facts. But we venture to affirm that it was impossible for Barnabas and Titus to have been at Jerusalem with Paul at the close of the second missionary journey, and under the circumstances described in Galatians ii. For how could there be any question of "com-

elling Titus, being a Greek, to be circumcised," years after the Apostles and elders and brethren at Jerusalem had decreed that the Gentiles need not be subjected to the rite? And as to Barnabas (to suspend for a moment the fatal objection from the want of any positive evidence of his presence), at the time when, being at Jerusalem with Paul, he conferred with the other Apostles concerning their work, the result of that conference was that *Paul and Barnabas* should go to the heathen. Accordingly, after the former visit we find Paul proposing to make such a joint visit to the churches—a plan which was only altered by the unhappy difference about John Mark. Surely, had the agreement referred to in Galatians ii. been made at a time subsequent to this quarrel, Paul and Barnabas would have hastened to act upon it with the added motive of perfecting their reconciliation in a new series of joint labors; and Barnabas would have been Paul's companion in his third missionary journey.

For these reasons we adhere to the view that the visit recorded in Galatians ii. must be identified, by internal evidence, with that of Acts xv.; and we have seen how the interval of fourteen years may be reconciled with the supposition that this visit took place in A.D. 50.

(B.) THESSALONICA.


The original name of this city was Therma; and that part of the Macedonian shore on which it was situated retained through the Roman period the designation of the Thermaic Gulf. The history of the city under its earlier name was of no great note. It rose into importance with the decay of Greek nationality. Cassander

the son of Antipater rebuilt and enlarged it, and named it after his wife Thessalonica, the sister of Alexander the Great. The name ever since, under various slight modifications, has been continuous, and the city itself has never ceased to be eminent. *Saloniki* is still the most important town of European Turkey, next after Constantinople. Under the Romans, when Macedonia was divided into four governments, Thessalonica was made the capital of the second; afterward, when the whole was consolidated into one province, this city became practically the metropolis. Strabo in the first century speaks of Thessalonica as the most populous city in Macedonia. It was the chief station on the great Roman Road, called the *Via Egnatia*, which connected Rome with the whole region to the north of the *Ægean Sea*. Placed as it was on this great Road, and in connection with other important Roman ways, Thessalonica was an invaluable centre for the spread of the Gospel. In fact it was nearly, if not quite, on a level with Corinth and Ephesus in its share of the commerce of the Levant. The circumstance noted in Acts xvii. 1, that here was the synagogue of the Jews in this part of Macedonia, had evidently much to do with the Apostle's plans, and also doubtless with his success. Trade would inevitably bring Jews to Thessalonica: and it is remarkable that, ever since, they have had a prominent place in the annals of the city. There is an arch of the early Imperial times, called the *Vardar* gate, which spans the main street of the city, at its western extremity. At its eastern extremity is another Roman arch of later date, and probably commemorating some victory of Constantine. The main street, which both these arches cross, and which intersects the city from east to west,

is undoubtedly the line of the *Via Egnatia*.

During several centuries this city was the bulwark, not simply of the later Greek Empire, but of Oriental Christendom, and was largely instru-

mental in the conversion of the Slavonians and Bulgarians. Thus it received the designation of "the Orthodox City;" and its struggles are very prominent in the writings of the Byzantine historians.



Ruins of the Theatre at Ephesus.

CHAPTER XVII.

ST. PAUL'S THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY; HIS ARREST AT JERUSALEM, AND IMPRISONMENT AT CÆSAREA. A.D. 54 TO A.D. 60.

- § 1. Extent and duration of Paul's Third Circuit—His constant conflict with the Judaizers. § 2. Paul in Galatia—The Judaizing teachers—The *Epistle to the Galatians* written from Ephesus. § 3. The Church of Ephesus—APOLLOS and the Twelve Disciples, who knew only the baptism of John—Apollon at Corinth—Paul's arrival at Ephesus. § 4. He preaches in the Synagogue, and is rejected by the Jews—Preaches in the School of Tyrannus—Spread of the Gospel through proconsular Asia—The special miracles of St. Paul, and his conflict with the magical arts. § 5. Defeat of the Jewish exorcists—Burning of the Books. § 6. Paul prepares to leave Ephesus—Mission of Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia and Achaia—Change in the Apostle's plan owing to news from Corinth—State of the Corinthian Church. § 7. Paul's *First Epistle to the Corinthians*—Internal evidence of its Date and Place. § 8. Question of a former Epistle and of an intermediate visit to Corinth. § 9. Contents and spirit of the Epistle. § 10. Sequel of St. Paul's stay at Ephesus—The Riot raised by Demetrius. § 11. Paul sets out for Macedonia—His labors at Alexandria Troas—Disappointment in not finding Titus there—He proceeds to Philippi and meets Titus. § 12. Paul's *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*—Its relation to the missions of Timothy and Titus—Question of an intermediate Epistle. § 13. Character and Contents of the Epistle—Questions about the particular offender and the opposition to St. Paul's authority—

'The peculiar spirit of the Epistle. § 14. The Apostle's labors in Macedonia and Illyricum—His arrival at Corinth—The *Epistle to the Romans*—Paul's views toward the West, now that his work in the East was done. § 15. Relation of the Epistle to the constitution of the Roman Church—Its mixed Jewish and Gentile character—The strong Greek element—Paul's personal relations to the Church—Spirit and Contents of the Epistle. § 16. Paul's journey from Corinth through Macedonia—Voyage from Philippi after the Passover—A week at Troas, and a farewell Sunday—Death and restoration of Eutychus. § 17. Voyage to Miletus—Discourse to the Ephesian Elders. § 18. From Miletus to Patara, and thence to Phœnicia—A week at Tyre, and another Sunday farewell. § 19. From Tyre to Cæsarea—Philip the Deacon and his daughters—Prophecy of Agabus—Journey to Jerusalem. § 20. Paul's reception by the Churches—Dangers from the Judaizers—Their calumnies—Paul joins four Nazarites in their vow—Is assaulted in the Temple, and rescued by the tribune Lysias—His defenses to the people and before the Sanhedrim—Plot against his life—He is sent to Cæsarea. § 21. His defense before Felix, and two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea—Felix superseded by Festus.

§ 1. It was—according to the different views explained in the preceding chapter—either in the beginning, or toward the autumn, of A.D. 54, that Paul, after another considerable stay at Antioch,¹ started again upon his old track, and “went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, confirming the disciples,” and also giving directions for the collection on behalf of the poor saints at Jerusalem.² This *Third Circuit* included a residence of no less than three years at Ephesus; a journey through Macedonia, and probably as far as Illyricum, which brought the Apostle to Corinth, where he spent the three winter months of A.D. 57–58. To disconcert a Jewish plot against his life, he returned through Macedonia and embarked at Philippi after the close of the Passover, and rejoined the companions who sailed direct from Corinth at Alexandria Troas. Thence he pursued his voyage, the course of which we are able to trace day by day, along the coast of Ionia, Caria, and Lycia, and across the Pamphylian and Cilician seas, to Tyre, Ptolemais (Acre), and Cæsarea, whence he went up by land to Jerusalem, to the Feast of Pentecost, and was there arrested in the Temple. The duration of the whole circuit was (according to the two dates of its commencement) either a little more, or a little less, than four years. The companions with whom the Apostle started on this journey are not mentioned. It seems probable that Silas remained at Jerusalem, whence he had originally been sent as one of the bearers of the apostolic edict; and we next find him as the associate of St. Peter, and the bearer of his Epistle to the

¹ Acts xviii. 23: ἐνι προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἱκανάς.

² 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.

churches of Asia Minor.* The *Acts* and *Epistles* contain abundant proofs that Timothy was with Paul during part of the circuit. Titus, though not mentioned in the *Acts*, appears in the 2d *Epistle* to the Corinthians as the Apostle's minister; and, to pass over less known names, Luke, who appears to have joined him at Philippi, furnishes the testimony of an eye-witness to the rest of the Apostle's career, down to both his imprisonments at Rome.

The whole proceedings and writings of the Apostle during this journey have the closest relation to that most important question with which his recent visit to Jerusalem was probably connected:—What was to be the relation of the new kingdom of Christ to the law and covenant of the Jews? Such a church as that of Corinth, with its affiliated communities, composed chiefly of Gentile members, appeared likely to overshadow by its importance the mother Church in Judæa. The jealousy of the more Judaical believers, not extinguished by the decision of the council at Jerusalem, began now to show itself everywhere in the form of an active and intriguing party-spirit. This disastrous movement could not indeed alienate the heart of St. Paul from the Law or the calling or the people of his fathers—his antagonism is never directed against these; but it drew him into the great conflict of the next period of his life, and must have been a sore trial to the intense loyalty of his nature. To vindicate the *freedom*, as regarded the Jewish law, of believers in Christ, but to do this for the very sake of maintaining *the unity of the Church*, was to be the earnest labor of the Apostle for some years. In thus laboring he was carrying out completely the principles laid down by the elder Apostles at Jerusalem; and may we not believe that, in deep sorrow at appearing, even, to disparage the Law and the covenant, he was the more anxious to prove his fellowship in spirit with the Church in Judæa, by “remembering the poor,” as “James, Cephas and John” had desired that he would?† The prominence given, during the journeys upon which we are now entering, to the collection to be made among his churches for the benefit of the poor at Jerusalem, seems to indicate such an anxiety. The great *Epistles* which belong to this period, those to the Galatians, Corinthians and Romans, show how the “Judaizing” question exercised at this time the Apostle's mind.

* 1 Peter v. 12. It is, however, doubted whether the “Silvanus, a faithful brother,” of this passage, is the same person as the Silas or Silvanus of the *Acts* and Pauline *Epistles*. (See chap. xix. § 17.) † Gal. ii. 10.

§ 2. His sharp conflict with the Judaizers began in the churches of Galatia, which now showed a lamentable change from the spirit with which they had received the Apostle on his first visit.⁶ Their fickle minds had evidently been captivated by the description given by the Judaizers of the privileges of the sons of Abraham, till they even "desired to be under the law." When Paul found it needful to speak plainly of the bondage into which they were thus bringing themselves, their former impulsive love was turned to resentment, and he "became their enemy because he told them the truth."⁶ His stay among them was probably brief, as he had to redeem his promise to the Ephesians; and, when the restraint of his presence was removed, the Judaizing teachers no longer dissembled their personal hostility to the Apostle. Like the same class of enemies at Corinth, they assailed his apostolic authority, and represented him as having derived his commission from the older Apostles, whose views (those of Peter and James for example) they probably insinuated that he opposed. Such was the occasion of his writing, most probably from Ephesus (A.D. 55),⁷ that short but pregnant *Epistle to the Galatians*, which contains the plainest possible statement of the leading doctrines of the Gospel, with a refutation of the Judaizing heresy, equally conspicuous for ingenuity and force of argument, for indignation against the false teachers, and compassionate love for the deluded disciples who were wronging themselves and him. He recalls to their minds the Gospel which he had preached among them, and asserts in solemn and even awful language its absolute truth.⁸ He declares that he had received it *directly from Jesus Christ the Lord*, and that his position toward the other Apostles had always been that, not of a pupil, but of an independent fellow-laborer. He sets before them Jesus the Crucified, the Son of God, as the fulfillment of the promise made to the fathers, and as the pledge and giver of freedom to men. He declares that in him, and by the power of the Spirit of sonship sent down through him, men have inherited the rights of adult sons of God; that the condition represented by the Law was the inferior and preparatory stage of boyhood. He then most earnestly and tenderly impresses upon the Galatians the responsibilities of their fellowship with Christ the Crucified, urging them to fruitfulness in all the graces of their

⁶ Gal. i. 6, iv. 11-20.

⁶ Gal. iv. 16. ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν.

⁷ The date of the Epistle has been

the subject of much controversy. Some refer it to the Apostle's stay at Corinth.

⁸ Gal. i. 8, 9.

spiritual calling, and especially to brotherly consideration and unity.

The date of the *Epistle to the Galatians* can be fixed with tolerable certainty by internal evidence. That it was written after Paul's second visit, is proved by his allusion to the first;⁹ but that the interval was not long, may be inferred from his mention of the speed with which their declension had followed on his departure:¹⁰ and these indications are confirmed by an allusion to the collection which the Apostle had been making for the poor saints of Judæa among the Galatian churches.¹¹ Mr. Lewin even finds an allusion to the very year, in the remonstrance against the observance of days, and weeks, and months and *years*;¹² as the Sabbatic year began on the 1st of Nisan in A.D. 55. At all events it seems most probable that the Epistle was written during Paul's residence at Ephesus.

§ 3. **EPHESUS** may be regarded as the central object of this third journey of the Apostle through Asia Minor. The city well deserved the importance which the Apostle evidently attached to the redemption of the promise he had made during his former hasty visit. What *Antioch* was for the region of Syria and Cilicia, what *Corinth* was for Greece, what *Rome* was—we may add—for Italy and the West, that *Ephesus* was for the important province called ASIA. Indeed, with reference to the spread of the Church Catholic, Ephesus occupied the central position of all. This was the meeting-place of Jew, of Greek, of Roman and of Oriental. Accordingly, the Apostle of the Gentiles was to stay a long time here, that he might found a strong Church, which should be a kind of mother-church to Christian communities in the neighboring cities of Asia.

In the interval between the visits of Paul, a new religious movement had been going on at Ephesus, under the impulse of one whose name, after being made at first the watchword of a rival party, has been handed down by the Apostle himself in close connection with his own. "A certain Jew named **APOLLOS**, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and, being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently *the things of the Lord*, knowing only *the*

⁹ Gal. iv. 13. τὸ πρότερον.

¹⁰ Gal. i. 6; iv. 18; v. 7.

¹¹ Gal. ii. 9: compare 1 Cor. xvi. 1. We learn from this passage that Paul had already instituted

in Galatia those systematic collections on the first day of the week, which he enjoins upon the Corinthians.

¹² Gal. iv. 10.

baptism of John,"¹³ His bold utterances in the synagogue attracted the notice of Aquila and Priscilla, who "received him"—probably into the Christian society meeting in their house—"and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." This instruction was doubtless in the way of conference, for we do not read of Aquila and Priscilla acting as public teachers. After spending some time at Ephesus, Apollos, being desirous of passing into Achaia, carried with him letters from the brethren at Ephesus to the Corinthian Church. On his arrival at Corinth, "he helped them much which had believed through grace; for he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ."¹⁴ His eloquence, acquired probably from the teaching of the Alexandrian schools, seems to have presented to some of the Corinthian converts those captivating qualities which they missed in the "plain speech" of Paul; and Apollos was raised, by no choice of his own, into the position of a party leader, with results which we have presently to notice. Meanwhile, the influence of the work which he had begun at Ephesus, before his association with Aquila and Priscilla, survived his departure. Apollos had already reached Corinth, when "Paul, having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus."¹⁵ Here he found twelve men, who, like Apollos, are called disciples; but who, on being asked by the Apostle whether they had received the Holy Ghost when they believed, confessed their ignorance that there was any Holy Ghost. "Unto what then were ye baptized?" asked Paul; and they said, "Unto John's baptism." Then, in the language of the Baptist himself, Paul explained to them that John's baptism of repentance was but introductory to faith in Him who should come after him, Christ Jesus. Upon this the men were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the imposition of Paul's hands they received the Holy Ghost, and spake with tongues, and prophesied."¹⁶

In this narrative, it must be carefully observed that "the baptism of John," which alone Apollos knew, and which he began by teaching at Ephesus, was a form of *Christian* belief, quite distinct from a certain anti-Christian heresy which

¹³ Acts xviii. 24, 25. 'Απολλῶς is an abbreviated form of 'Απολλώνιος; and the *Codex Bezae* has the latter form, or (for the reading is indistinct) perhaps 'Απολλόδωρος.

¹⁴ Acts xviii. 25-28.

¹⁵ Acts xix. 1. The ἀνωτερικά μέρη

seem to be the highlands about the sources of the Hermus and Mæander, the border-land between Phrygia and proconsular Asia, at which the Apostle was forbidden to enter Asia on his Second Circuit.

¹⁶ Acts xix. 1-7.

sprang up at an early period in the history of the Church, maintaining that John the Baptist was the Messiah. The question of the precise relation of the form of belief held by Apollos and the others to the full profession of Christianity has been much disputed; but little more light can be thrown upon it than that derived from Paul's mode of dealing with the twelve disciples. We are led to suppose that a knowledge of the baptism of John and of the ministry of Jesus had spread widely, and had been received with favor by some of those who knew the Scriptures most thoroughly, before the message concerning the exaltation of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Ghost had been received. An account of the great events that had occurred in Palestine seems to have been spread abroad by Jews who, having visited the country before the effusion of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, had received only the baptism of John, and had a very imperfect idea of the relation of his mission to that of Christ. The belief of Apollos and the twelve brethren concerning the character and work of Jesus seems to have been wanting in recognition of the full lordship of Jesus and of the gift of the Holy Ghost.

§ 4. After this incident, Paul entered on his public ministry at Ephesus according to his usual plan, and with the usual result. For three months he spoke boldly in the synagogue, "disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God." Of that same congregation who had been so eager for his return, some indeed received his testimony, but others were only hardened and disobedient, till they went on to speak evil "of *that way*" before the people. Thereupon Paul, as at Corinth, withdrew entirely from the synagogue, taking with him the disciples as a separate congregation, which met in the school of a certain Tyrannus (doubtless a professional lecturer on rhetoric and philosophy), where he discoursed daily for two full years. That long period gave an opportunity for all the people of Asia to hear the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks. The phrase used by St. Luke seems to imply the diffusion of the Gospel through the province by the Apostle's personal ministry in tours undertaken from Ephesus as his head-quarters. For it must be observed, that the narrative furnishes no account of Paul's occupations during the two years of his Ephesian ministry; save those touching allusions of his own at a later time, to his serving the Lord with all humility of mind, amid sorrows and trials from the plots of the Jews,—to his teaching from house to house, as well as publicly,—to his not ceasing to warn every man night and day with

tears."¹⁷ Instead of such details, the writer of the *Acts* seems to have been intent on exhibiting Ephesus—the capital of the civilization, idolatry and corruption of the richest province of the Roman empire—as the scene of a signal conflict between the kingdom of Satan and the kingdom of light.

For Paul's teaching was confirmed by "special miracles"—miracles of no ordinary nature, so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them."¹⁸ This most striking mode of conveying healing power by the mere contact of an object seemed peculiarly to challenge comparison with the many forms of magic and incantation that were rife at Ephesus. "It is evident that the arts of sorcery and magic—all those arts which betoken belief in the presence of a spirit, but not of a Holy Spirit—were flourishing here in great luxuriance."¹⁹ It was to be clearly shown that Paul's miracles were wrought by no such arts, but by the healing power of the Lord Jesus himself.

§ 5. The Jews were the first to challenge a decisive contest, in the spirit of their countrymen, who had confessed the source of their own exorcisms when they accused our Saviour of casting out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. Every province was infested with itinerant Jewish magicians, like Simon Magus and Elymas. Seeing probably, like Simon, a new form of charm in the *name of Jesus*, certain of these "vagabond Jews, exorcists," attempted to use it upon those possessed with evil spirits, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus, whom Paul preacheth." In one case, the experiment led to a result as decisive as it was unexpected. The seven sons of a Jewish chief priest, named Sceva, engaged in such an exorcism; and we can fancy the parade of gestures and mutterings with which they "mopped and mowed" around the patient; when suddenly the evil spirit found a voice to repeat the confessions which the powers of darkness had so often made of Jesus and of Paul himself, and cried out, "*Jesus* I know (acknowledge), and *Paul* I know; but who are ye?" As the cry was uttered, the possessed man attacked his exorcists and overpowered them, so that they fled out of the house naked

¹⁷ Acts xx. 19, 20, 31.

¹⁸ Acts xix. 8-18. *δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τοιαύτας*. The fact that Paul performed miracles of the same extraordinary character as those of Peter at Jerusalem (Acts v. 15) has a manifest bearing upon his equality with

the rest of the Apostles; and a similar likeness has been observed in Paul's conferring the Holy Ghost upon the twelve disciples to the work of Peter and John at Samaria.

¹⁹ Maurice, *Unity of the New Testament*, p. 515.

and wounded, exposing their shameful failure to the public gaze."²⁰

The affair became known to all the Greeks and Jews who dwelt at Ephesus; and this signal proof of the Apostle's command, in the name of Jesus, over the world of spirits, caused fear to fall upon all men, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified. A new practical effect was produced even among those who had already believed; and many who seem to have been slow to abandon magic arts, now confessed and showed their deeds.²¹ To confession they added sacrifice, bringing forth piles of those books containing the formulæ of magic, which derived their very name from the city,²² and formed most valuable articles of merchandise, to be publicly burned. The total value of the books thus destroyed was computed at 50,000 *denarii*, or about 1770*l*. The evangelist, who records this great blow to magic as a decisive triumph of Christian truth,²³ might well have been astounded, if he had seen such arts revived in Christian countries, and tampered with, if not believed in, by Christian men.

§ 6. It was shortly after this affair that Paul, having now spent two years and a quarter at Ephesus, began to make arrangements for his further journey into Greece. St. Luke tells that "Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome. So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus; but he himself stayed in Asia for a season."²⁴ The natural inference would be that Paul intended to pursue his former route through Macedonia to Corinth, and that the mission of Timothy and Erastus was to prepare the Macedonian and Achaian Churches for his visit,²⁵ and especially to get ready the contribution for the poor saints at Jerusalem, according to the plan which the Apostle had appointed for the churches of Galatia:—"Upon the first day of the week, let every one of

²⁰ Acts xix. 13-16. The words *κατακυρώσας αὐτῶν ἰσχυροὶ κατ' αὐτῶν* evidently imply a severe struggle.

²¹ τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν, that is, those evil practices, the nature of which appears from the context, not their every-day life.

²² Ἐπίσθια γράμματα. These are said to have been for the most part sentences copied from the inscriptions on various parts of the idol, and sold at an immense price as charms.

²³ Acts xix. 20. "So mightily grew the word of the Lord, and prevailed."

²⁴ Acts xix. 21, 22. It is important to observe how definitely the visit to Rome formed a part of the Apostle's plan, as we also learn from the Epistle to the Romans.

²⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 17. The intention that Timothy should go on from Macedonia to Corinth is also referred to in 1 Cor. xvi. 10.

you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." ²⁶ But to the Church of Corinth the mission of Timothy had a further object:—"to bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ." We shall soon see how needful it was thus to recall to the remembrance of the Corinthians those apostolic lessons and examples, the impression of which had been well-nigh effaced by party spirit and moral corruption.

It is plain that the *order* of this journey is quite of secondary importance, and that St. Luke's "Macedonia and Achaia" may quite as well mean "Achaia and Macedonia," if this order be required by other evidence. Such evidence we seem to have in the words of St. Paul himself; for, in the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, written, as we shall presently see, from Macedonia in the course of this journey, he describes his plan as follows. After expressing his earnest hope, confirmed anew from what had occurred meanwhile, that they would continue to acknowledge to the very end the truths that he had preached and written to them, he adds:—"And, *in this confidence*, I was minded to come unto you before, that ye might have a second benefit, and to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia unto you, and of you to be brought on my way toward Judæa." ²⁷ Here we have the plan of a journey with the same general object as that described in the *Acts*, embracing both Achaia and Macedonia, only in the opposite order, and ending by a return to Jerusalem, in order, as we afterward learn, to carry thither the contributions of the Gentile churches. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the two passages refer to the same journey, and the variation in the order presents no real difficulty. ²⁸ But, though unimportant as a matter of criticism, this variation is of deep interest in connection with the Apostle's career, and with his relations to the church of Corinth. The strong asseverations which follow the passage just quoted, that there was no fickleness, no *Yea, yea!* and *Nay, nay!* in these his plans, any more than in his doctrine—in language that might seem extravagant in relation to the question of making a journey at one time rather than another—lead up to the very cogent motives that caused the Apostle to change

²⁶ 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.

²⁷ 2 Cor. i. 15, 16.

²⁸ It is perfectly in keeping with the practice of the best historians, that St. Luke, writing after the event, should have described the Apostle's plan in

its ultimate form, without encumbering his narrative with an account of the intermediate intentions, or feeling it necessary to explain that Timothy and Erastus were sent forward before the change of plan.

his plan :—"Moreover, I call God as a witness to my soul, that *to spare you I came not as yet unto Corinth* : But I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in sorrow :"—and then he says how, amid the former sorrow thus referred to, he had written his First Epistle, "not to grieve them, but that they might know the abundance of his love for them."²⁰

That First Epistle explains the source of all this sorrow, and the influence it had on the Apostle's change of plan. Certain brethren, who came to Ephesus from Corinth, and whom, with true Christian honor, he mentions by name, had brought him afflicting news concerning the Corinthian church : "It hath been declared unto you my brethren, by those of the house of Chloë, that there are contentions among you."²¹ Nor was this the worst. The church had been disgraced by scandalous immorality, without any censure upon the offender, and, among other grave disorders in worship, the Lord's Supper had been profaned into a riotous feast. Now comes out the character of Paul. A man of his fearless plain-speaking zeal might perhaps have been expected to hasten to Corinth, and combat with the evil in person. But he takes counsel of a kindlier wisdom. *To spare them*, he delays his visit to Corinth, and determines to make his journey by way of Macedonia first; then to stay awhile at Corinth, and probably to winter there, and to be brought on by them on his further journey. Meanwhile he resolved to stay at Ephesus till Pentecost, to improve his growing success—"a great and effectual door is opened unto me"—and to combat the "many adversaries," of whom we shall soon hear more. In case Timothy, who had already been sent into Macedonia, apparently with directions to wait for Paul at Corinth, should arrive there, he is commended to their regard, in terms which imply a fear of insult from the Anti-Pauline party, and they are bidden to send him forth in peace, that he might return to Paul.²¹

²⁰ 2 Cor. i. 12-ii. 10.

²¹ 1 Cor. i. 11, 12.

²¹ 1 Cor. xvi. 1-11. There is a distinct intimation of Paul's change of route in the words *Μακεδονίαν γὰρ διέρχουμαι* (ver. 5). Comparing vv. 3 and 6, it seems doubtful whether the Apostle now adhered to his purpose of returning to Jerusalem, or whether he intended to send the collection by messengers from Corinth, while he himself went forward on his contem-

plated journey to Rome. We shall see presently how it happened that he returned after all through Macedonia. The absence of Timothy from Ephesus when the Epistle was written is indicated also by the omission of his name from the superscription. It appears from 1 Cor. iv. 17 (especially the words "*for this cause*") that, even at the time of Timothy's departure, the Apostle had heard enough of what was going on at Corinth to make

§ 7. While thus arranging his plans so as to give his disciples at Corinth a space for repentance before his arrival, he stimulated them to that repentance, and gave directions for that reformation of their disorders which would prepare for his coming to them in joy and peace, by writing the letter from which the above particulars have been gathered, the *First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Its contents give decisive indications of its date and place: it was written after Paul's second visit to Galatia;²² after the mission of Timothy, and Erastus;²³ and after the change in the Apostle's plans. St. Paul alludes to his being still in Asia, and at Ephesus, whence he was contemplating his departure at the ensuing Pentecost;²⁴ circumstances which fix the date to the spring of his last year's residence at Ephesus (A.D. 57). The suggestion, that the date may be more exactly fixed to the season of the Passover by the allusion to that feast, is both ingenious and reasonable.²⁵ The Epistle was no doubt sent, as the subscription states,²⁶ by the hands of Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus, who had lately come from Corinth, as we shall presently see, and who are especially commended to the honorable regard of the Church.²⁷ The supposition that they were accompanied by Titus seems to be negatived by the absence of any mention in the First Epistle of that mission of his on which so much stress is laid in the second,²⁸ and which evidently took place shortly after the dispatch of the First

him feel the necessity of reminding them of "his ways in Christ;" unless we may suppose that this was a further injunction written to Timothy in Macedonia. On the other hand, Mr. Lewin conjectures that, when Paul changed his plan, he sent to recall Timothy, whose arrival at Corinth seems to be referred to doubtfully in chap. xvi. 10; but we must not lay too much stress on the contingent sense of *ἐὰν δέ*.

²² 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

²³ 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10.

²⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 19. Ephesus is named as the place whence the Epistle was written both in Vatican MS. and the Coptic Version.

²⁵ 1 Cor. v. 6-8. The Passover fell this year on April 1st. The inference that the Epistle was written after the tumult excited by Demetrius—from the idea that it is alluded to

figuratively in the passage, "If, after the manner of man (*κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*, *secundum hominem*, 'as a man may do'), I fought with beasts at Ephesus" (1 Cor. xv. 32)—is at least doubtful. The contrary inference may be drawn from the absence of any clearer allusion, compared with the distinct mention in the 2d Epistle of "our troubles which came to us in Asia, . . . insomuch that we despaired even of life" (2 Cor. i. 8), and coupled with the fact that St. Paul left Ephesus directly after the tumult (Acts xx. 1).

²⁶ It must be remembered that these subscriptions to the Epistles are no part of the original documents, and only express opinions of various degrees of probability. Some of them, however, have the authority of high antiquity.

²⁷ 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18.

²⁸ 2 Cor. xii. 18.



Epistle, and while Paul was still at Ephesus; as he expected—though his anxiety caused him to expect it too soon—to meet Titus at Troas on his return from Corinth.”³⁹ The allusion to the presence of Apollos is not only important as another mark of time, but as an indication of his complete concord with Paul in the reproofs addressed to the Corinthians for making parties in the name of the Apostle and himself. It would seem that Paul wished him to go to Corinth with the bearers of the Epistle and enforce its admonitions, but that Apollos, with wise delicacy, preferred to postpone his visit, lest his presence should rather inflame the dissensions:—“As touching our brother Apollos, I greatly desired him to come unto you with the brethren: but his will was not at all to come at this time; but he will come when he shall have a convenient time.”⁴⁰

§ 8. Such were the circumstances under which St. Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians. But besides the occasion furnished by the information received from those of the house of Chloë, we learn that the Epistle was written in reply to a letter of inquiry from the Corinthians themselves upon certain questions of great importance;⁴¹ which letter was brought to Ephesus by Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus, the same brethren who carried back the Apostle’s answer.⁴² But further, it is now generally supposed that the Epistle contains allusions to a visit, not mentioned in the *Acts*, which Paul paid to Corinth, during the first half of his stay at Ephesus, and to a letter which he wrote to the Church soon after this visit, and before that which is now called the First Epistle. The ingenuity of these conjectures has caused them to be perhaps too hastily received. The hypothesis of a former Epistle, which is not now extant, rests on the slight evidence of a single allusion.⁴³ The arguments for the sup-

³⁹ 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13.

⁴⁰ 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

⁴¹ 1 Cor. vii. 1.

⁴² 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 18: comp. ver. 12.

⁴³ 1 Cor. v. 9: *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, κ.τ.λ.*, “*I wrote to you in the letter* [not, as the A.V. has it, in a letter] not to keep company with fornicators; yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous or extortioners or idolaters—for then must ye needs go out of the world:—but now I wrote to you [*νυνὶ δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν*] not to keep company, if any man *that is called a brother* be

a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, etc.,”—where the repetition of the same word, *ἔγραψα*, is concealed in the A.V. by the contrasted tenses *I wrote* and *I have written*. There may certainly be a contrast between a general direction, which had been given in a former letter and misunderstood, and its plainer repetition now in consequence of the gross sin which had arisen. But on the other hand, the well-known use of the Aorist as a Present Indefinite (which it clearly is in ver. 11) allows us to take the passage as an emphatic reitera-

posed visit to Corinth are derived entirely from the use in certain passages of the phrases, *the third time, again*, and so forth; but, so long as they are not proved incapable (as Paley has shown) of another interpretation, they can not be held conclusive in the absence of direct historic evidence." But, at all events, the decision of this doubtful question is of little consequence compared with the ample evidence, furnished by the Epistle itself, of the sleepless vigilance and untiring affection with which Paul kept up communication with the Church at Corinth, amid all his troubles and conflicts at Ephesus,—a

tion, rather than as a contrast (like the very similar reiteration in 1 John ii. 12-14): "*I write to you in my letter*," etc.; only do not misunderstand me, "*for now I write to you*," etc. The fact that the occasion of the injunction has just been alluded to as *new matter* (1 Cor. v. 1) is a strong argument against any former letter in reference to it; and, moreover, the hypothesis that the Apostle, on his supposed visit to Corinth, had pronounced a judgment on this matter, which he now emphatically repeats, seems to be negatived by ver. 3: "*I verily, as absent in body but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that hath so done this deed*;"—referring to the judgment of excommunication which he goes on to pronounce.

"2 Cor. xii. 14, *τρίτον τοῦτο ἐτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, and xiii. 1, *τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*. It is enough to say that the *τρίτον* here refers to an *intention*, and not necessarily to a visit. 2 Cor. xii. 21, *μη πάλιν ἐλθόντα με ταπεινώσῃ ὁ Θεός*: here certainly the natural sense is "*lest on my coming again (i. e., for the second, not the third time) God should humble me*," rather than "*God should humble me again*;" and this may serve to explain 2 Cor. ii. 1, *ἐκρίνα μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν*, where the *ἐν λύπῃ* seems to be inserted between the *πάλιν* and *ἐλθεῖν* for the sake of emphasis. The whole spirit of the context and of the Epistle seems to be, not that he feared having to pay them a *second sorrow-*

ful visit, but that, after having had so much joy when first he preached the Gospel among them, he would not expose them and himself to pain and humiliation on his return. 2 Cor. xiii. 2, *προεῖρηκα καὶ προλέγω, ὡς παρών τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ἀπών, νῦν*, furnishes an argument for the theory, by taking *παρών* and *ἀπών* as parallel respectively to *προεῖρηκα* and *προλέγω*. But it is admitted, that the latter clause may mean "*as if I were present a second time, though now absent*," and assuredly the most natural reference of the *προεῖρηκα* is to the decisive judgment pronounced in the First Epistle on the offender. The A.V. makes the case plainer by joining *τὸ δεύτερον* with *προλέγω*, and *ἀπών* with the following word *γράφω*, which, however, is wanting in the best MSS. Here again, if we look at the spirit of the parallel passages in the Epistle, the allusion appears to be to the severity which the Apostle hoped to be spared using when he should come, rather than to that which he had used on a former visit (2 Cor. x. 1, 2, 10, 11; xiii. 10). On the other hand, the Apostle's allusions to personal opposition and contempt of his bodily presence certainly seem better explained by some humiliation received in a personal visit, than by any thing that happened during his first preaching at Corinth. Paley regards 2 Cor. i. 15 as decisive against the supposed visit; but the "*second benefit*" may refer to the *double visit* which Paul at first contemplated.

striking instance of "that which came upon him daily, the care of all the churches."

§ 9. This varied and highly characteristic letter, addressed not to any party, but to the whole body of the large Judæo-Gentile church of Corinth,⁴⁶ was called forth first, as we have seen, by the information the Apostle had received from members of the household of Chloë that there were divisions in the Church; that parties had been formed which took the names of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, and of Christ:⁴⁷—secondly, by the moral and social irregularities that had begun to prevail, of which the most conspicuous and scandalous example was that a believer had taken his father's wife, without being publicly condemned by the Church;⁴⁸ to which we must add one doctrinal error, of those who said "that there was no resurrection of the dead;"⁴⁹—thirdly, by the inquiries that had been specially addressed to St. Paul by the Church of Corinth on several matters relating to Christian practice. It is probable that the teaching of Apollos the Alexandrian, which had been characteristic and highly successful,⁵⁰ had been the first occasion of the divisions in the Church. We may take it for granted that his adherents did not form themselves into a party until he had left Corinth, and therefore that he had been some time with St. Paul at Ephesus. But after he had gone, the special *Alexandrian* features of his teaching were remembered by those who had delighted to hear him. Their Grecian intellect was captivated by his broader and more spiritual interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures. The connection which he taught them to perceive between the revelation made to Hebrew rulers and prophets and the wisdom by which other nations, and especially their own, had been enlightened, dwelt in their minds. That which especially occupied the Apollos school must have been a *philosophy of the Scriptures*. It was the tendency of this party which seemed to the Apostle particularly dangerous among the Greeks. He hardly seems to refer specially in his letter to the other parties, but we can scarcely doubt that in what he says about "the wisdom which the Greeks sought"⁵¹ he is referring not only to the general tendency of the Greek mind, but to that tendency as it had been caught and influenced by the teaching of Apollos. It gives him an occasion of delivering his most characteristic testimony. He recognizes wisdom, but it is the wisdom of God; and that wisdom was not *only*

⁴⁶ Acts xviii. 4, 8, 10.—⁴⁷ 1 Cor. i. 11, 12.—⁴⁸ 1 Cor. v. 1, vi. 7, xi. 17-22, xiv. 33-40.—⁴⁹ 1 Cor. xv. 12.—⁵⁰ Acts xviii. 27, 28.—⁵¹ 1 Cor. i. 22.

a *Σοφία* or a *Λόγος*, through which God had always spoken to all men; it had been perfectly manifested in Jesus the Crucified. Christ crucified was both the Power of God and the Wisdom of God. To receive him required a spiritual discernment unlike the wisdom of the great men of the world; a discernment given by the Holy Spirit of God, and manifesting itself in sympathy with Christ's humiliation and love.

The contents of this Epistle are extremely varied, and almost preclude a more specific analysis than we here subjoin. The Apostle opens with his usual salutation, and with an expression of thankfulness for their general state of Christian progress.⁶¹ He then at once passes on to the lamentable divisions there were among them, and incidentally justifies his own conduct and mode of preaching,⁶² concluding with a notice of the mission of Timothy, and of an intended authoritative visit on his own part.⁶³ The Apostle next deals with the case of incest that had taken place among them, and had provoked no censure,⁶⁴ noticing, as he passes, some previous remarks he had made upon not keeping company with fornicators.⁶⁵ He then comments on their evil practice of litigation before heathen tribunals,⁶⁶ and again reverts to the plague-spot in Corinthian life, fornication and uncleanness.⁶⁷ The last subject naturally paves the way for his answers to their inquiries about marriage,⁶⁸ and about the celibacy of virgins and widows.⁶⁹ The Apostle next makes a transition to the subject of the lawfulness of eating things sacrificed to idols, and Christian freedom generally,⁷⁰ which leads, not unnaturally, to a digression on the manner in which he waived his Apostolic privileges, and performed his Apostolic duties.⁷¹ He then reverts to and concludes the subject of the use of things offered to idols,⁷² and passes onward to reprove his converts for their behavior in the assemblies of the Church, both in respect to women prophesying and praying with uncovered heads,⁷³ and also their great irregularities in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.⁷⁴ Then follow full and minute instructions on the exercise of spiritual gifts,⁷⁵ in which is included the noble panegyric of charity,⁷⁶ and further a defense of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, about which doubts and difficulties appear to have arisen in this unhappily divided Church.⁷⁷ The Epistle closes with some directions

⁶¹ 1 Cor. i. 1-9.—⁶² Chaps. i. 10, iv. 16.—⁶³ Chap. iv. 17-21.—⁶⁴ Chap. v. 1-8.—⁶⁵ Chap. v. 9-13.—⁶⁶ Chap. vi. 1-8.—⁶⁷ Chap. vi. 9-20.—⁶⁸ Chap. vii. 1-24.—⁶⁹ Chap. vii. 25-40.—⁷⁰ Chap. viii.—⁷¹ Chap. ix.—⁷² Chaps. x.-xi. 1.—⁷³ Chap. xi. 2-16.—⁷⁴ Chap. xi. 17-34.—⁷⁵ Chaps. xii.-xiv.—⁷⁶ Chap. xiii.—⁷⁷ Chap. xv.

concerning the contributions for the saints at Jerusalem,"⁶⁶ brief notices of his own intended movements,"⁶⁷ commendation to them of Timothy and others,"⁷⁰ greetings from the churches,"⁷¹ and an autograph salutation and benediction."⁷²


We must not omit to observe how loyally the Apostle represents Jesus Christ, the Crucified, as the Lord of men, the Head of the body with many members, the Centre of Unity, the Bond of men to the Father. We should mark at the same time how invariably he connects the Power of the Spirit with the Name of the Lord Jesus. He meets all the evils of the Corinthian Church, the intellectual pride, the party spirit, the loose morality, the disregard of decency and order, the false belief about the Resurrection, by recalling their thoughts to the Person of Christ and to the Spirit of God as the Breath of a common life to the whole body. We observe also here, more than elsewhere, the *tact*, universally recognized and admired, with which the Apostle discusses the practical problems brought before him. The various questions relating to marriage,"⁷³ the difficulty about meats offered to idols,"⁷⁴ the behavior proper for women,"⁷⁵ the use of the gifts of prophesying and speaking with tongues,"⁷⁶ are made examples of a treatment which may be applied to all such questions. We see them all discussed with reference to first principles; the object, in every practical conclusion, being to guard and assert some permanent principle. We see St. Paul no less a lover of order and subordination than of freedom. We see him claiming for himself, and prescribing to others, great variety of conduct in varying circumstances, but under the strict obligation of being always true to Christ, and always seeking the highest good of men. Such a character, so steadfast in motive and aim, so versatile in action, it would be difficult indeed to find elsewhere in history.

What St. Paul here tells us of his own doings and movements refers chiefly to the nature of his preaching at Corinth; "⁷⁷ to the hardships and dangers of the apostolic life; "⁷⁸ to his cherished custom of working for his own living; "⁷⁹ to the direct revelations he had received; "⁸⁰ and to his present plans."⁸¹ He bids the Corinthians raise a collection for the Church at Jerusalem by laying by something on the first day of the week, as he had directed the churches in Galatia to do. He says that he shall tarry at Ephesus till Pentecost, and then set out

⁶⁶ Chap. xvi. 1-4.—⁶⁷ Chap. xvi. 5-9.—⁷⁰ Chap. xvi. 10-18.—⁷¹ Chap. xvi. 19-20.—⁷² Chap. xvi. 21-24.—⁷³ Chap. vii.—⁷⁴ Chaps viii., x.—⁷⁵ Chaps. xii., xiv.—⁷⁶ Chap. xiv.—⁷⁷ Chaps. i., ii.—⁷⁸ Chap. iv. 9-18 —⁷⁹ Chap. ix —⁸⁰ Chaps. xi. 23, xv. 8.—⁸¹ Chap. xvi.

on a journey toward Corinth through Macedonia, so as perhaps to spend the winter with them. He expresses his joy at the coming of Stephanas and his companions, and commends them to the respect of the Church.

§ 10. Having dispatched this Epistle, he stayed on at Ephesus, where "a great door and effectual was opened to him, and there were many adversaries;" and he would neither hastily withdraw from the work, nor leave the new disciples to face their enemies alone. The Pentecost, after which he proposed to set out, was evidently not far off when he wrote; and his stay was shortened by the tumult which arose, as St. Luke tells us, "at the same time."²¹ We may fairly interpret this indefinite note of time by the circumstance that the *Ephesia*, or great annual festival of Artemis (Diana), the patron deity of Ephesus, fell in the month of Artemisius (May).²² At that festival the rude wooden statue of the goddess,²³ fa-



Greek Imperial Coin of Ephesus and Smyrna allied.

bled to have fallen down from heaven, was exhibited to the holiday-keeping multitude in the splendored Ionic temple, which was one of the wonders of the world; and games were celebrated, with dramatic entertainments, in honor of the goddess. If, in the decay of pagan faith, there wanted the fervid religious exaltation of a Jewish festival, there were still ample materials in the idle and excitable Greek populace to be stirred up to tumult by the interested persons who lived by their religion. These found a leader in Demetrius, one of the many silversmiths who pursued a most gainful trade in making those portable models of the shrine of the goddess, which were set up in houses and carried about on journeys, for which a special demand would naturally be expected among the country people who came to the festival. The success of the Gospel threatened the loss of custom, and so "there arose no small stir about that way." The "great and effectual door" had proved so

²¹ Acts xix. 23.

²² Boeckh, *Corp. Inscr.*, No. 2954; Lewin, *s. a.* 57.

²³ The accompanying coin will give some notion of the image, which was grotesque and archaic in character.

inviting that, according to the testimony of the leader of the "many adversaries," "not only at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that *they be no gods which are made with hands.*" We have seen Claudius himself lamenting the growing neglect of the hereditary rites of the gods; but the imperial concern for the national worship was mingled at Ephesus with more homely motives, which are avowed with amusing frankness — "So that *not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought*; but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshipeth." The manufacturer, calling together his workmen, with the artificers of like occupation,⁶⁴ addressed to them the argument—irresistible to those who held that gain was godliness—"Sirs, *ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.*" Their rage broke out in the cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" and the tumult soon spread to all the city. Eager, it would seem, to vent their wrath on Paul, but not finding him, they seized his traveling companions, Gaius and Aristarchus of Macedonia, and rushed with one accord into the theatre.⁶⁵ Paul desired to face the danger in his own person; but the remonstrances of the disciples were supported by some of the magistrates called *Asiarchs*,⁶⁶ who were his friends, and who sent to entreat him "that he would not adventure himself into the theatre." Meanwhile the mob gathered there were in utter confusion:⁶⁷ and the words of Luke present a graphic picture of a populace rushing to a meeting under a sudden and vague impulse:—"Some raised one cry and some another: . . . and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together." The Jews, taught by the experience of Alexandria, Cæsarea, and other cities, to believe themselves in

⁶⁴ It is an interesting comment on these passages to find "Alexander the coppersmith" among the opponents of St. Paul at Ephesus at a later period (2 Tim. iv. 14).

⁶⁵ We have already seen, in the case of Alexandria, that the theatre was the scene of the tumultuous meetings at which cruel indignities were inflicted on the Jews (chap. v. § 6).

⁶⁶ These *Ἀσιάρχαι* were the presidents, ten in number, of the games then celebrating, the expenses of which they bore. Several names of men who held the office are still to

be read on coins and inscriptions. They were elected annually, subject to the approval of the proconsul, and were invested with a kind of sacerdotal character. The office was sought even by men of consular rank. There were similar presidents of the games in the other provinces of Asia Minor, the *Galatarchs*, *Bithyniarchs*, *Lyciarchs*, etc.

⁶⁷ It must not be supposed, from the phrase *ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη*, that there was even the pretense of its being an *ecclesia*, or regular assembly.

the greatest danger, put forward a certain Alexander;⁴⁷ whether to plead their cause, or, as Calvin supposes, that, being a Christian convert, he might be made a sort of scape-goat. By the gesture of the hand usual with speakers in the assemblies, Alexander asked for a hearing; but the word no sooner went round that he was a Jew, than the rallying-cry was raised again, and for two whole hours the people shouted, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians." The riot would probably have passed into a massacre like those of Alexandria; but Ephesus was fortunate in her chief magistrate, whom Luke, with his wonted accuracy, calls the scribe or clerk.⁴⁸ This officer, after appeasing the multitude, addressed them in a speech of admirable policy. He reminded them that this violent zeal was superfluous, since it was a fact universally known, and beyond all gainsaying, that the city of the Ephesians was the "devotee"⁴⁹ of the great Artemis, and of the image that fell down from Jove. It was likewise useless for any practical object. The men against whom it was aimed were neither guilty of sacrilege, nor of blasphemy against the goddess.⁵⁰ If

⁴⁷ See note 84, p. 519.

⁴⁸ Γραμματεὺς, i. e., the Keeper of the Records, ver. 35. The inscriptions show that this was the actual title of the chief magistrate of Ephesus, and mention by name several of those who bore it. He kept the archives; read public documents before the

Senate and Ecclesia; saw money deposited in the temple; and letters to the state were addressed to him.

⁴⁹ Νεώροπος, an epithet constantly found on the coins of Ephesus, as well as of other Asiatic cities. It means temple-sweeper; and was originally used as an expression of humility.



Greek Imperial Copper (coin ("aureolion") of Laodicea of Phrygia, with the epithet ΝΕΩΡΟΠΟΣ; Commodus; with name of Asiatarch.

Obv.: Bust of Emperor. Rev.: Figure in triumphal quadriga of Roma.

⁵⁰ A striking testimony to the wise moderation of Paul in his contest with

Demetrius and the workmen with him had any charge to bring against any one, the courts were sitting at that very time, and the proconsuls were ready to hear them.⁹¹ As for any other matters that required discussion, they could be settled in the next assembly duly summoned on the regular day.⁹² This allusion to the degree in which the people still enjoyed their own internal government as a "free city,"⁹³ was enforced by a significant hint of the imperial displeasure:—"For we are in danger to be called in question for this day's uproar, there being no cause whereby we may give an account of this course." With these words, he dismissed the assembly.⁹⁴

§ 11. After the cessation of the tumult, in which, for the first time, we see the spirit, no longer of Jewish but of heathen hostility, breaking out in full fury against the Gospel, Paul set out for Macedonia. His journey already fixed for Pentecost (May 28), would naturally be somewhat hastened by the riot; but that he made no precipitate flight is shown by his calling the brethren together and embracing them, before his departure.⁹⁵ St. Luke briefly records his passage through Macedonia, exhorting the disciples in many a discourse;⁹⁶ and his arrival in Greece, where he abode three months (Nov. to Feb. A.D. 57-8).⁹⁷ Important light is thrown upon the interval by the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, which was written upon the journey. Pursuing the usual route along the coast, probably by sea, Paul reached Troas, the port of departure for Europe, bent on his evangelic work, and found a door opened to him of the Lord. But his own peace of mind was broken by the disappointment of not finding Titus, whom he had expected to meet him there with the

idolatry. The word *ιεροσούλους* is that which the A.V. strangely translates "robbers of churches."

⁹¹ Ἀγόραιοι ἄγονται καὶ ἀνθύπατοί εἰσιν. Ephesus was one of the assize towns, *fora* or *conventus*, at which the proconsul held his court in turn. The word ἀνθύπατοι, which, in the case of the supreme governor of the province, can not be explained as an indefinite plural, affords another indication of St. Luke's accuracy. In A.D. 54, Junius Silvanus, the proconsul of Asia, was poisoned by P. Celer and Helius, the two imperial procurators, at the instance (it was said) of Nero or of Agrippina. The murderers seem to have assumed the proconsular government for a period which just

corresponds to Paul's residence at Ephesus; for at the end of this year, A.D. 57, we find Celer at Rome accused by the Asiatics of maladministration. (Lewin, *s. a.* 57.)

⁹² Ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

⁹³ Ephesus, under the Romans, was a *libera civitas*, with its popular assembly (δῆμος, ἐκκλησία, vv. 30, 33, 39), its senate (γερονσία or βουλή, mentioned by Strabo and Josephus), and its own magistrates, the γραμματεὺς already mentioned, being the chief.

⁹⁴ Acts xix. 23-41. ⁹⁵ Acts xx. 1.

⁹⁶ Acts xx. 2 : παρακαλέσας αὐτοὺς λόγῳ πολλῷ. He was probably accompanied by Tychicus and Trophimus. ⁹⁷ Acts xx. 3.

tidings of the reception of his First Epistle.⁹⁹ That his success at Troas was mingled with fresh outbreaks of heathen opposition, may be inferred from that solemn passage in which, while thanking God that the Gospel preached by him was nowhere without effect, he records, with overwhelming emotion, its two opposite results:—"Now thanks be to God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life. And *who is sufficient for these things?*"¹⁰⁰ These are the words of an Apostle seeing many of those whom he was laboring to save reject the counsel of God against themselves; but that many received it, is seen by the state in which he found the Church of Troas on his return.¹⁰¹

These complicated anxieties still distracted the Apostle when he landed, as before, at Neapolis, and crossed the mountains to Philippi:—"When we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side: without were fightings, within were fears."¹⁰² This was the time chosen by "God that comforteth those that are cast down" to comfort the Apostle by the arrival of Titus, and still more by the news he brought from Corinth.¹⁰³ There can be little doubt that the meeting took place at Philippi; and here also, if not before, Paul was rejoined by Timothy, whether he had made that place the head-quarters of his work, with Erastus, in Macedonia, or whether he also had reached it on his return from Corinth.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13. The inference that his restlessness of mind hindered his work at Troas does not seem borne out by the passage. On the contrary, he appears to fall back upon the momentous issues of his work for consolation under his personal disappointment; and this view suggested that almost awfully solemn description of the trust committed to the minister of Christ, which comes in between his allusions to his stay at Troas and his arrival in Macedonia (2 Cor. ii. 14, vii. 4).

¹⁰⁰ 2 Cor. ii. 14-16.

¹⁰¹ Acts xx. 7-11, see § 16.

¹⁰² 2 Cor. vii. 5. Besides the *prima facie* probability that Paul fol-

lowed the usual route, we may be sure that, in traveling through Macedonia, he would not pass by Philippi, both for many other reasons, and because the liberality of that Church, proved from the very beginning, would be of the utmost consequence to the collection he was now making. Both the Epistles to the Corinthians contain repeated allusions to arrangements made in Macedonia for that collection. In 2 Cor. xi. 9, *Macedonia* is clearly used as equivalent to *Philippi*, just as we have seen *Asia* used for *Ephesus*.

¹⁰³ 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7.

¹⁰⁴ 2 Cor. ii. 1. The conjunction of Timothy with Paul in the super-

§ 12. These circumstances concur with all the internal evidence, to mark both the time and place of St. Paul's *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. It was written after the troubles that had befallen the Apostle in Asia;¹⁰⁴ after his preaching and disappointment at Troas, his arrival in Macedonia, and the consolation received there by his meeting with Titus; while he was engaged in making the collection for the poor at Jerusalem;¹⁰⁵ and in immediate anticipation of a renewed visit, whether it were his second or third, to Corinth.¹⁰⁶ One specific date is furnished by the mention of his rapture fourteen years before; but, as this is the sole allusion to that event, we can only say that the fourteen years carries us back to one of the epochs at which we know that St. Paul was at Jerusalem, on the mission from Antioch with Barnabas in A.D. 44 or 45.¹⁰⁷

The Epistle was written under the impulse of deep and complex emotions, which we have the Apostle's own authority for tracing to the news brought to him by Titus. But here a most interesting question is opened by various points of internal evidence, concerning the several missions of Timothy and Titus to Corinth, and their combined influence in exciting the feelings under which the Apostle wrote. We have already seen that Timothy had been sent into Macedonia, with the express intention that he should proceed to Corinth, there to discharge the mission of recalling the wavering Church to the Apostle's "ways in Christ."¹⁰⁸ On the view that Timothy fulfilled this part of his mission,¹⁰⁹ it is supposed that the intelligence which he brought upon his return—that a certain faction in the Corinthian Church had now gone the length of openly questioning Paul's authority—made the Apostle feel the necessity of at once dispatching to the contentious Church one of his immediate followers, with instructions to support and strengthen the effect of the First Epistle,

scription of the Epistle is, of course, a decisive proof of Timothy's presence at Philippi, whence it was written.

¹⁰⁴ 2 Cor. i. 8.

¹⁰⁵ 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13, vii. 5, viii. 1, ix. 1.

¹⁰⁶ 2 Cor. i. 15, xii. 14, xiii. 1.

¹⁰⁷ 2 Cor. xii.; Acts xi. 30.

¹⁰⁸ Acts xix. 21; 1 Cor. iv. 17.

¹⁰⁹ Besides the conjecture, noticed above, that, on the change in the Apostle's plans, Timothy was recalled from Macedonia, it is urged that, if his mission to Corinth had been ful-

filled, Paul would hardly have passed it over in silence while mentioning the mission of Titus and another brother (2 Cor. xii. 17, 18). But the reply seems satisfactory, that, as Timothy was associated with Paul in the writing of the Epistle, any allusion to him in the third person would have been inappropriate; while Timothy's share in the Epistle would have a peculiar force if he had recently been giving the like admonitions to the Church in his own person.

and to bring back the most recent tidings of the spirit that was prevailing at Corinth: and hence the mission of Titus, accompanied by another brother, whom some suppose to have been Luke.¹¹⁰ It has been further conjectured, that the Apostle, provoked by the open attack upon his authority, made Titus the bearer of another Letter (supplementary, so to speak, to the First Epistle), containing the sharpest rebukes, *using* the authority which had been denied, and threatening to enforce it speedily by his personal presence. This, it is supposed, was the letter written "out of much affliction and anguish of heart, with many tears,"¹¹¹ and in a tone so severe that the Apostle at first repented having written it, though he repented no longer when he found that the sorrow it had caused the disciples for a time was "a godly sorrow, working repentance unto salvation not to be repented of."¹¹² But there seems quite enough severity in the First Epistle to have moved the disciples to such feelings, and so to have caused the Apostle these alternations of regret and satisfaction. After the distinct intimation of his intention of following up that letter by his personal presence,¹¹³ another letter in the same tone would have looked like the weakness of repeating threats in place of action. Sound criticism forbids the assumption of unrecorded facts and non-extant documents, till every other explanation fails; and we may justly suspect the conjectures, however ingenious, which result in there having been *four* epistles to the Corinthians instead of two. All, therefore, that we can affirm with certainty is, that Paul, while still in Asia, and probably some little time after the writing of the First Epistle, sent Titus on a mission to Corinth, the result of which, awaited with the utmost anxiety, and received by the Apostle in Macedonia, roused those mingled and passionate emotions, under which—in conjunction with Timothy, who had rejoined him at some uncertain period, whether from Corinth or not—he wrote the Second Epistle to the Corinth-

¹¹⁰ 2 Cor. xii. 18. The graphic narrative of the tumult at Ephesus, so manifestly that of an eye-witness, accords with the very brief notice in the *Acts* of the journey through Macedonia, in pointing to the conclusion that Luke left St. Paul after the tumult, probably for Corinth, whence he accompanied Paul on his return (Acts xx. 1-6, where the *us* of ver. 5 distinctly places the writer among Paul's immediate companions). If,

then, he accompanied Titus, the latter could not have left till after the tumult, and the interval before Paul's arrival at Troas must have been longer than is usually supposed. It is also clear that, if Timothy's return was the cause of the mission of Titus, he must have rejoined Paul in Asia, as Paul expected the return of Titus at Troas.

¹¹¹ 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4.

¹¹² 2 Cor. vii. 8-12.

¹¹³ 1 Cor. iv. 18-21.

ians. It was sent by the hands of Titus, who showed a spontaneous readiness to accept the Apostle's proposal that he should return to Corinth, and finish the collection, which he had begun on his former visit with a success that had caused him great joy, and had justified the boast which the Apostle had made of the liberality of the Corinthians.¹¹⁴ Titus was accompanied by two brethren, not mentioned indeed by name, but recommended to the Church in very emphatic terms as among the most eminent and faithful of Paul's companions.¹¹⁵

§ 13. This Epistle reveals to us what manner of man St. Paul was when the fountains of his heart were stirred to their inmost depths. How the agitation which expresses itself in every sentence of this letter was excited, is one of the most interesting questions we have to consider. Every reader may perceive that, on passing from the First Epistle to the Second, the scene is almost entirely changed. In the *First*, the faults and difficulties of the Corinthian Church are before us. The Apostle writes of these, with spirit indeed and emotion, as he always does, but without passion or disturbance. He calmly asserts his own authority over the Church, and threatens to deal severely with offenders. In the *Second*, he writes as one whose personal relations with those whom he addresses have undergone a most painful shock. The acute pain given by former tidings—the comfort yielded by the account which Titus brought—the vexation of a sensitive mind at the necessity of self-assertion—contend together for utterance. What had occasioned this excitement?

The solution of this question must be sought in the contents of the Epistle itself. They are very varied; but may be arranged generally under the three following heads:—1st, The Apostle's account of the character of his spiritual labors, accompanied with notices of his affectionate feelings toward his converts;¹¹⁶ 2d, Directions about the collections;¹¹⁷ 3d, Defense of his own Apostolical character.¹¹⁸ A close analysis is scarcely compatible with our limits, as in no one of the Apostle's epistles are the changes more rapid and frequent. Now he thanks God for their general state;¹¹⁹ now he

¹¹⁴ The importance attached to this part of the mission of Titus and his companions is seen in 2 Cor. ix. 8, 5.

¹¹⁵ 2 Cor. viii. 16-24. It is usually supposed that these two brethren were Luke (ver. 18) and Trophimus (ver. 19). In the marginal references to the A. V. a confusion is made between

this and the previous mission of Titus (xii. 18); and indeed it is not easy, in some of the very similar expressions, to distinguish which refer to each visit.

¹¹⁶ Chaps. i-vii. ¹¹⁷ Chaps. viii., ix.

¹¹⁸ Chaps. x.-xiii. 10.

¹¹⁹ Chap. i. 8, foll.

glances to his purposed visit; ¹²⁰ now he alludes to the special directions in the first letter; ¹²¹ again he returns to his own plans, ¹²² pleads his own Apostolic dignity, ¹²³ dwells long upon the spirit and nature of his own labors, ¹²⁴ his own hopes, ¹²⁵ and his own sufferings, ¹²⁶ returning again to more specific declarations of his love toward his children in the faith, ¹²⁷ and a yet further declaration of his views and feelings with regard to them. ¹²⁸ Then again, in the matter of the alms, he stirs up their liberality by alluding to the conduct of the churches of Macedonia, ¹²⁹ their spiritual progress, ¹³⁰ the example of Christ, ¹³¹ and passes on to speak more fully of the present mission of Titus and his associates, ¹³² and to reiterate his exhortations to liberality. ¹³³ In the third portion he passes into language of severity and reproof; he gravely warns those who presume to hold lightly his Apostolical authority; ¹³⁴ he puts strongly forward his Apostolical dignity; ¹³⁵ he illustrates his forbearance; ¹³⁶ he makes honest boast of his labors; ¹³⁷ he declares the revelations vouchsafed to him; ¹³⁸ he again returns to the nature of his dealings with his converts, ¹³⁹ and concludes with grave and reiterated warning, ¹⁴⁰ brief greetings, and a doxology. ¹⁴¹

Amid this variety of matter, there is one point which forms a sort of key-note to all the rest: the allusions to some particular offender, whose sin, connived at by the Church, had called forth those rebukes, which were followed by the Apostle's double anxiety, on the one hand, lest he should have written too severely, and on the other, that his remonstrances might bring back the Church to harmony with himself. This was the chief cause of the agitation with which he awaited the return of Titus, and of the emotions of joy and thankfulness caused by his arrival. For the tidings brought by Titus were mainly favorable. The better part of the Church were returning to their spiritual allegiance to their founder; and the old spirit of love and reverence toward St. Paul had been re-awakened. ¹⁴² The offender had been censured by his brethren, and had made submission; and the Apostle, adding his full forgiveness, declares the punishment to have been sufficient, and asks the Church to comfort the penitent. ¹⁴³ The

¹²⁰ Chap. i. 15, foll.—¹²¹ Chap. ii. 3, foll.—¹²² Chap. ii. 12, foll.—¹²³ Chap. iii. 1, foll.—¹²⁴ Chap. iv. 1, foll.—¹²⁵ Chap. v. 1, foll.—¹²⁶ Chap. vi. 1, foll.—¹²⁷ Chap. vi. 11, foll.—¹²⁸ Chap. vii.—¹²⁹ Chap. viii. 1, foll.—¹³⁰ Ver. 7.—¹³¹ Ver. 9.—¹³² Ver. 18, foll.—¹³³ Chap. ix. 1, foll.—¹³⁴ Chap. x. 1, foll.—¹³⁵ Chap. xi. 5, foll.—¹³⁶ Ver. 8, foll.—¹³⁷ Ver. 23, foll.—¹³⁸ Chap. xii. 1, foll.—¹³⁹ Ver. 12, foll.—¹⁴⁰ Chap. xiii. 1, foll.—¹⁴¹ Vers. 11-14.—¹⁴² 2 Cor. i. 13, 14, vii. 9, 15.—¹⁴³ Chap. ii. 5-11.

common inference, naturally drawn from a comparison of the two Epistles, is that these expressions relate to the incestuous person, concerning whose case the Apostle had so sharply censured the negligence of the Church.¹⁴⁴ Upon this view the other portions of the Epistle, in which the Apostle so vehemently vindicates his own authority, refer to the other and less grateful side of the intelligence brought by Titus, namely, that a certain faction in the Church still showed a spirit of opposition, which had even grown into more direct personal hostility to the Apostle. But recent critics, viewing the matter in connection with the supposed intermediate epistle, and with the mission of Timothy as well as Titus, believe the offender to have been the prime mover of the anti-Pauline party. Thus much seems clear,—that there were two distinct movements of opposition in the Corinthian Church: that already referred to as the *Alexandrian*, arising out of the preaching of Apollos; and the *Jewish*, the partisans of which took the name of Cephas (Peter) for their watch-word.¹⁴⁵ The latter faction seems to have greatly strengthened by the arrival of some person or persons, who came with letters of commendation from the Judæan Church, and who openly questioned the commission of him whom they proclaimed to be a self-constituted Apostle.¹⁴⁶ As the spirit of opposition and detraction grew strong, it is supposed that the tongue of some member of the Church (more probably a Corinthian than the stranger or strangers) was loosed. He scoffed at St. Paul's courage and constancy, pointing to his delay in coming to Corinth, and making light of his threats.¹⁴⁷ He demanded proofs of his Apostleship.¹⁴⁸ He derided the weakness of his personal presence, and the simplicity of his speech.¹⁴⁹ He even threw out insinuations touching the personal honesty and self-devotion of St. Paul.¹⁵⁰ When some such attack was made openly upon the Apostle, the Church had not immediately called the offender to account; the better spirit of the believers being cowed, apparently, by the confidence and assumed authority

¹⁴⁴ 1 Cor. v.

¹⁴⁵ 1 Cor. i. 12. The very word *Cephas*, which is the Chaldee form of Peter's name, and which only occurs elsewhere in the Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Galatians (i. 18, ii. 9, 10, 14), sufficiently proves the directly Jewish origin of this faction. Whether Peter himself had visited Corinth, is one of the disputed ques-

tions which we can only glance at. There is no direct authority in the N. T. for such a fact; but ecclesiastical tradition makes Peter a joint founder of the church at Corinth, as of those of Antioch and Rome.

¹⁴⁶ 2 Cor. iii. 1, xi. 4, 12-15.

¹⁴⁷ 2 Cor. i. 17, 28.

¹⁴⁸ 2 Cor. xii. 11, 12.

¹⁴⁹ 2 Cor. x. 10.

¹⁵⁰ 2 Cor. i. 12, xii. 17, 18.

of the assailants of St. Paul. Such was the state of things which is supposed to have been reported to the Apostle, and which led to the mission of Titus, whose intelligence of the rebuke of the offender and the return of the better part of the Church to its allegiance caused the Apostle to write the *Second Epistle*, to smooth the way for his coming to the Church in restored harmony; and while Titus, with the two brethren, carried it to Corinth, Paul himself remained to complete his work in Macedonia.

In support of this view it is argued, that the usual interpretation of 2 *Cor.* ii. 5-11, as referring to the incestuous person of 1 *Cor.* v., does not account so satisfactorily for the whole tone of the Epistle, and for the particular expressions relating to the offender; nor does it find places so consistently for the missions of Timothy and Titus. Moreover, the language of 2 *Cor.* ii. 5-10 is quite natural upon the supposition that the Apostle had been the object of a personal attack; while it seems unlikely that Paul would have treated the sin of the man who took his father's wife as an offense against himself, nor that he would have chosen to speak of it as *a wrong done to another*¹⁸¹—supposed to be the father. But these arguments seem hardly sufficient to counteract the first impression which the Epistle leaves upon a reader, that the Corinthians had removed the great source of trouble which had weighed upon the Apostle's mind, by repenting of their moral delinquencies and expelling the chief offender from their society, but that the conflict respecting Paul's Apostleship had grown to new dimensions, which called forth new assertions of his authority, made with an earnestness hardly intelligible on the supposition that it was his opponent who had been punished. The language of the Apostle on this point seems to refer to new matter which had arisen, not only since the divisions rebuked in the First Epistle, but since any other Letter that Paul may be supposed to have written before the Second. Such is, in brief, the state of this controversy. What remains as certain is, that the harmony between the Apostle and the Corinthians had been sufficiently restored to excite the hope that he might come to them in love and joy; but that there was still much even in regard to morality, as

¹⁸¹ *Ἀδικία*, 2 *Cor.* vii. 12: "he that suffered wrong" is, upon this view, Paul himself. The difficulty of the whole question may be judged of from the division among the highest authorities. The new view is held, wholly or in part, by Bleek, Credner, Olshausen, De Wette, and Neander; while Stanley, Alford, Davidson, and (with some hesitation) Conybeare and Howson, adhere to the common opinion.

well as party-spirit, to cause fears of a grievous disappointment,—to avert which he sends before him this Second Epistle.¹⁵² “Therefore”—he says—“I write these things, being absent, lest being present I should use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord hath given to me to edification, and not to destruction.”¹⁵³ Whichever view we take of the circumstances, the highly-wrought personal sensitiveness, the ebb and flow of emotion, so peculiarly characteristic of this Epistle, are as intelligible as they are noble and beautiful. Paul’s protestations relating to his Apostolic work, and his solemn appeals to God and Christ, are in place; and we enter into his feelings as he asserts his own sincerity and the openness of the truth which he taught in the Gospel.¹⁵⁴ We see what sustained him in his self-assertion; he knew that he did not preach himself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. His own weakness became an argument to him, which he can use to others also, of the power of God working in him. Knowing his own fellowship with Christ, and that this fellowship was the right of other men too, he would be persuasive or severe, as the cause of Christ and the good of men might require.¹⁵⁵ If he was appearing to set himself up against the churches in Judæa, he was the more anxious that the collection which he was making for the benefit of those churches should prove his sympathy with them by its largeness. Again he would recur to the maintenance of his own authority, as an Apostle of Christ, against those who impeached it. He would make it understood that spiritual views, spiritual powers, were *real*; that if he knew no man after the flesh, and did not war after the flesh, he was not the less able for the building up of the Church.¹⁵⁶ He would ask them to excuse his anxious jealousy, his folly and excitement, while he gloried in the practical proofs of his Apostolic commission, and in the infirmities which made the power of God more manifest; and he would plead with them earnestly that they would give him no occasion to find fault or to correct them.¹⁵⁷

§ 14. The remaining part of the interval between Paul’s departure from Ephesus in May and his arrival at Corinth for the winter—an interval which he would naturally prolong, to give time for the Epistle to do its work—affords time, not only for his finishing the collection in Macedonia, but for that advance westward toward the shores of the Adriatic which he mentions in words that seem to contain an emphatic allu-

¹⁵² 2 Cor. xii. 19-21, xiii. 1-3.—¹⁵³ 2 Cor. xiii. 10.—¹⁵⁴ Chaps. iii., iv.

¹⁵⁵ Chaps. iv., v.—¹⁵⁶ Chap. x.—¹⁵⁷ Chap. xi., xii., xiii.

sion to the completion (at least in outline) of the evangelization of the eastern division of the empire, preparatory to a movement upon Rome itself:—"So that from Jerusalem, and in a circuit as far as *Illyricum*, I have fulfilled the Gospel of Christ."¹⁵⁸ This view agrees well with Luke's brief notice of Paul's visit to Macedonia:—"When *he had gone through those parts*,¹⁵⁹ and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months." This passage, in which it is remarkable that even the name of Corinth is not mentioned, looks almost as if left to be filled up from the Apostle's letters. Among the many allusions to Corinth as the object of this journey, there is one in which he declares the distinct intention of wintering there;¹⁶⁰ and, as we shall presently see, the time of his departure makes it clear that his three months' abode at Corinth extended from about the end of November, A.D. 57, to about the end of February, A.D. 58. Those three months might well have been fully occupied with the final settlement of the questions, and correction of the disorders, which fill so large a space in the two Epistles to the Church, and in visits to the other churches of the province of Achaia. But, amid these labors, the Apostle found time for the composition of that wonderful work, which has ever since formed the chief foundation of Christian theology. The blank left in the narrative of St. Luke is filled up by that colossal monument of the inspired genius of St. Paul, the *Epistle to the Romans*. The internal evidences, both of place and date, are not only perfectly distinct, but they show why the Epistle was written at this juncture.¹⁶¹ Paul writes as the guest of Gaius, whom we know as one of the most conspicuous members of the Corinthian Church.¹⁶² He sends salutations from Erastus, the chamberlain of the city,¹⁶³ from Timotheus his fellow-laborer, and from Sosipater, whom we presently find accompanying him on his voyage from Greece to Asia.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁸ Rom. xv. 19. It should be remembered that the division between the East and West, from the time of Octavian and Antony to that of Diocletian, was made at the Adriatic. *Illyricum* was now already used in the extended sense which included *Dalmatia*. (Comp. 2 Tim. iv. 10.)

¹⁵⁹ διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκείνα, Acts xx. 2.

¹⁶⁰ 1 Cor. xvi. 6.

¹⁶¹ The commendation to the Roman Church of "Phœbe, a servant (or deaconess, *διάκονον*) of the church at Cenchreæ," by no means implies

that the Epistle was written from that port; but simply that Paul availed himself of Phœbe's departure to forward it to Rome. The connection would naturally be close between the churches of Cenchreæ and Corinth; and it may be observed, in passing, as an interesting fact, that the Christians of the port should have formed a community distinct from those of the city.

¹⁶² Rom. xvi. 23.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Rom. xvi. 21: comp. Acts xx.

4. Among these salutations, it is in-

He mentions the completion, not only in Macedonia, but also in Achaia, of the collection, which he was then on the point of carrying to the poor saints at Jerusalem.¹⁶⁵

This sacred mission of charity was now the only remaining hindrance to the gratification of a desire which he had cherished for many years, but which his labors in the East had hitherto postponed, to visit the Church of Rome, and even to extend his western mission as far as Spain.¹⁶⁶ We have contemplated the Apostle on the track of Alexander: we now see him yearning, but in how much nobler a spirit, for the conquest of new worlds. His great work of breaking up new ground, of planting the Churches, which his successors, like Apollos, were to water, was now done in the Greek division of the Roman world. "But now *having no more place in these regions*,"¹⁶⁷ is a striking description of a completed work, as coming from one who, in every word as well as deed, lived in all good conscience toward God. May we not also regard them as a lesson when to leave to God the issues of a work, begun in faith and diligence, but far too vast to be finished in all its details? Nor must we overlook the prominence which the Apostle assigns to one character of his work: "Yea! so have I strived to preach the Gospel, *not where Christ was named*, lest I should build upon another man's foundation: but as it is written, to whom he was not spoken of, they shall see; and they that have not heard shall understand."¹⁶⁸ This he held to be an essential feature of that mission on which he was sent to the Gentiles, "ministering as a priest in the Gospel of God,"¹⁶⁹ that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost;"¹⁷⁰ and, while he does not hesitate to declare that "he had something to boast of through Jesus Christ in the things pertaining to God," as to the fruits of his past labors, the same rule was to be his guide for the future. It is very striking that, ardent and long-cherished as was his desire to see his Christian brethren at Rome, he speaks of its approaching fulfillment as but a passing visit, on his way to break up virgin soil for the good seed in Spain.¹⁷¹ And accordingly (as also in the Epistle to the

teresting to learn the name of the brother who was St. Paul's amanuensis, "I, Tertius, *who wrote this Epistle*, salute you in the Lord" (ver. 22).

¹⁶⁵ Rom. xv. 25-28.

¹⁶⁶ Rom. xv. 22-24.

¹⁶⁷ Rom. xv. 23.

¹⁶⁸ Rom. xv. 20, 21: comp. 2 Cor.

x. 13, 15, 16. The quotation is from Is. lii. 15.

¹⁶⁹ *ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ.* ¹⁷⁰ Rom. xv. 16, 17.

¹⁷¹ Rom. xv. 24, 28. "Whosoever *I take my journey into Spain*, I will come to you: for I trust to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my

Hebrews) the powerful arguments and earnest exhortations of the Epistle are marked by a tone different from that in which he addresses his own converts, as if they were the substitute for a more direct ministration of the Word.

The providence of God had appointed that Paul should do a greater and more permanent work at Rome, as the result of movements which form an affecting contrast to those which he thus shadows forth. The very errand of mercy to Jerusalem, which he regards as but a temporary delay of his inroad upon the West, was the cause of his being sent as a prisoner to the capital, where his two years' enforced residence provided for the work he had to do both among Jews and Gentiles. Nor does he write without a presentiment of this result, which was soon to ripen into a prophetic certainty. He entreats the Roman Christians, by their common Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit, to wrestle together with him¹⁷² in their prayers to God on his behalf, "*That I may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judæa*, and that my service for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints; that I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed."¹⁷³

§ 15. The Epistle itself throws a clear light upon the peculiar motives, added to the general interest attaching to the capital of the world, which led the Apostle so ardently to cherish the desire, "I must also see Rome." The twofold aspect of his life, as the converted Jew and the Apostle of the Gentiles, as the Christian missionary ever invading new provinces of heathendom, and the Hebrew of the Hebrews yearning for the salvation of Israel, would move him to deep sympathy with the Church of Rome; nor could his honest pride in his Roman franchise fail to be another motive to labor for the spiritual freedom of his fellow-citizens. Regarding Rome solely from the classical point of view, we might be surprised—as many doubtless have felt surprise—at the perpetual appeal to Jewish feelings and associations, and the perpetual contest with Jewish prejudices, which runs through the whole Epistle. But the readers of Horace and Juvenal are aware

way thitherward by you, if first I be somewhat filled with your company. But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister to the saints. . . . When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, *I will come by you into Spain.*" We shall have to recur to the support which this passage is supposed to give to the tradi-

tion that St. Paul actually visited Spain, and even extended his labors into Britain. It need only be observed in this place, that an *intention* can not of itself furnish *historical evidence* of the corresponding fact. (See chap. xix. § 8.)

¹⁷² συναγωνισασθαι μοι.

¹⁷³ Rom. xv. 30-32.

how strong was the Jewish element in Roman society. We have already had occasion to notice the early propagation of Christianity among the Roman Jews; and we shall soon see Paul, on his first arrival at the city, addressing himself as specially to them and meeting with the same obstinate unbelief, save from the few, as when he preached in the Eastern synagogues. Moreover, as if to anticipate the great usurpation of the later Romish Church, this Christian society owed its foundation neither to St. Peter nor to any other Apostle, but appears, so to speak, as the spontaneous development of the Christian faith, introduced probably by the Jews who went up to the great Pentecost.¹⁷⁴ It was natural that such a community should have within it a peculiar element of Judaism, needing the correction which the Apostle supplies in the wonderful arguments of the Epistle, and exciting the ardent interest on behalf of Israel which is no less conspicuous throughout it. But it is equally clear that there was a strong, and perhaps even more numerous Gentile element in the Church; an element, however, which seems to have been rather Greek than Roman. It may have been that foreigners resident in the capital had a tendency to gravitate toward one another, and that the Greeks, more familiar with the "peculiar people," did not regard them with the same aversion as the Romans did: but, whatever the explanation, nothing is more certain than the apparent paradox, that the Church of Rome was Greek rather than Latin. A curious indication of the relative proportion, both of Jews to Gentiles, and of Greeks to Romans, in the Church, is furnished by the long list of names in the salutation at the end of the Epistle.¹⁷⁵ These names belong, for the most part, to the middle and lower grades of society. Many of them are found in the *columbaria* of the freedmen and slaves of the early Roman emperors. It was among the less wealthy merchants and tradesmen, among the petty officers of the army, among the slaves and freedmen of the imperial palace, "those that are of Cæsar's household"¹⁷⁶—whether Jews or Greeks—that the Gospel would first find a footing. The intimate personal element in some of the salutations at once attests the presence of Hellen-

¹⁷⁴ The fiction of St Peter's foundation of the Church of Rome will be noticed afterward. (See chap. xix. § 19.)

¹⁷⁵ Rom. xvi. 6-15. We must not, however, forget the frequent use of Greek and Roman names by Jews, a

circumstance which may perhaps reduce the supposed preponderance of Gentiles in the Church. The emphasis laid on the word *Gentiles* in i. 18, seems rather to refer to *Rome* than to the composition of the Church. (See ver. 15.) ¹⁷⁶ Philipp. iv. 22.

ist Jews, and adds another motive for St. Paul's deep interest in the Roman Church:—"Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen, and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the Apostles, who also were in Christ before me;"—a graceful and affecting recognition of Christian precedence.¹⁷⁷ Among Paul's personal friends at Rome were now numbered Aquila and Priscilla, whose claims on the Apostle's affection and the gratitude of all the Church were enhanced by some special danger that they had incurred for his sake (the cause, perhaps, of their having left Ephesus again for Rome),¹⁷⁸ and whose house, as at Ephesus, was the place of meeting of a Christian society, which Paul recognizes as a church.¹⁷⁹ We can not doubt that many converts, made by Paul himself and the other ministers of the Gospel throughout the empire, were continually converging to Rome, and adding to the vigor of the Church, which had by this time gained such distinction that "their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world."¹⁸⁰

This composition of the Church, and these personal relations of the Apostle to it, account for the peculiar tone which distinguishes the Epistle to the Romans. While earnestly praying that he might at length have a prosperous journey to come to them, as he had often proposed, that he might have some fruit among them, as among the other Gentiles—for, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, he was debtor both to the Greeks and the barbarians, to the wise and unwise, and was ready, to his utmost ability, to preach the Gospel at Rome also—he supplies the lack of his personal presence, and prepares for his coming by a *grand manifesto of the Gospel* as the one salvation for all the classes that were gathered in the composite Roman Church. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."¹⁸¹ That Gospel was invariably the announcement of Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Lord of men, who was made man, died, and was raised again, and whom his heralds present to the faith and obedience of mankind. Such a *κήρυγμα* might be variously commended to different hearers. In speaking to the Roman

¹⁷⁷ Rom. xvi. 7. This allusion to some imprisonment of St. Paul is another proof that the *Acts* does not give a complete account of his labors, and affords a confirmation of the view which refers the record of his sufferings in 2 Cor. xi. to the period of his early labors in Syria and Cilicia: for there it was that his impris-

onment would most naturally be shared by his kinsfolk.

¹⁷⁸ Rom. xvi. 3, 4: "Who for my life laid down their own necks." Some fancy that they rescued Paul in the tumult at Ephesus.

¹⁷⁹ Ver. 5: "Likewise greet the church that is in their house."

¹⁸⁰ Rom. i. 8.

¹⁸¹ Rom. i. 16.

Church, St. Paul represents the chief value of it as consisting in the fact, that through it the righteousness of God, as a righteousness not for God only, but also for men, was revealed. It is natural to ask what led him to choose and dwell upon this aspect of his proclamation of Jesus Christ. The following answers suggest themselves:—(1.) As he looked upon the condition of the Gentile world, with that *coup d'œil* which the writing of a letter to the Roman Church was likely to suggest, he was struck by the awful wickedness, the utter dissolution of moral ties, which has made that age infamous. His own terrible summary¹⁸³ is well known to be confirmed by other contemporary evidence. The profligacy which we shudder to read of was constantly under St. Paul's eye. Along with the evil, he saw also the beginnings of God's judgment upon it. He saw the miseries and disasters, begun and impending, which proved that God in heaven would not tolerate the unrighteousness of men. (2.) As he looked upon the condition of the Jewish people, he saw them claiming an exclusive righteousness, which, however, had manifestly no power to preserve them from being really unrighteous. (3.) Might not the thought also occur to him, as a Roman citizen, that the empire, which was now falling to pieces through unrighteousness, had been built up by righteousness, by that love of order and that acknowledgment of rights which were the great endowment of the Roman people? Whether we lay any stress upon this or not, it seems clear that to one contemplating the world from St. Paul's point of view, no thought would be so naturally suggested as that of the need of the *true* Righteousness for the two divisions of mankind. How he expounds the truth, that God's own righteousness was shown in Jesus Christ to be a righteousness which men might trust in—sinners though they were—and by trusting in it submit to it, and so receive it as to show forth the fruits of it in their own lives; how he declares the union of men with Christ as subsisting in the Divine idea and as realized by the power of the Spirit,—may be seen in the Epistle itself. The remarkable exposition contained in ch. ix. x., xi., illustrates the personal character of St. Paul, by showing the intense love for his nation which he retained through all his struggles with unbelieving Jews and Judaizing Christians, and by what hopes he reconciled himself to the thought of their unbelief and their punishment. Having spoken of this subject, he goes on to exhibit in practical counsels the same love of Christian unity,

¹⁸³ Rom. i. 21-32.

moderation, and gentleness, the same respect for social order, the same tenderness for weak consciences, and the same expectation of the Lord's coming, and confidence in the future, which appear more or less strongly in all his letters.

§ 16. The Epistle was sent by the hands of Phœbe to Rome, on the eve of St. Paul's departure for Jerusalem, which may be fixed about the end of February, as he was at Philippi at the Passover (March 27, A.D. 58). He was on the point of starting by sea for Syria, when the discovery of a Jewish plot to waylay him caused him to take the overland route by way of Macedonia.¹⁸³ But his traveling companions from the various places he had visited—associated with him, probably, in the mission of carrying the contributions of their respective churches—went on by sea to Troas, doubtless carrying the money with them.¹⁸⁴ The resumption of the first person in the *Acts* indicates that Luke was the immediate companion of St. Paul; and the details of the voyage are given with such precision that we can fix the daily dates with high probability.¹⁸⁵

The narrative of the Apostle's voyage begins from Philippi, whence Paul sailed "after the days of unleavened bread," that is, on the day following the eighth day of the feast (Tuesday, April 4th), and he reached Troas in five days (Saturday, April 8th).¹⁸⁶ He had remained there a full seven days, when, on the return of the first day of the week (Sunday, April 16th), the disciples came together to break bread, and Paul preached to them, ready to depart on the morrow. Here we have one of the incidental notices—more valuable than any formal statement, because they show how regularly the custom was established—of those meetings of the Christians on the Lord's Day for social converse and divine worship, which Pliny mentions as their only known institution.¹⁸⁷ Unable, for the most part, to withdraw from the service of their masters during the day, they met either—as Pliny tells us—before day-light, or, as on this occasion at Troas, after sunset. The congregation, like that of the first disciples at Jerusalem, met in an upper chamber, where Paul—for the time was not come when utterances out of the abundance of the heart were measured by the min-

¹⁸³ Acts xx. 3.

¹⁸⁴ Acts xx. 4. Their names were Sopater of Berea; Aristarchus and Secundus, of the Thessalonians; Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus; and of Asia, Trophimus and Tychicus.

¹⁸⁵ This has been done by Mr.

Lewin in the *Fasti Sacri*; and we have followed his dates, which must not, however, be considered as established with absolute certainty.

¹⁸⁶ Acts xx. 6.

¹⁸⁷ Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10.

ute—continued his discourse till midnight, and was only then interrupted by an accident. A youth named Eutychus, who was sitting in the window, overpowered with drowsiness through the heat of the many lamps, fell down from the third story and was taken up dead. The miracle by which Paul restored him to life resembled in form those performed by Elijah and Elisha,¹⁸⁸ while it again illustrated the compassionate saying of our Lord,—“The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.” Returning to the upper chamber, without waiting till the youth’s friends had the comfort of seeing his full recovery (ver. 12), Paul broke bread and ate with the disciples, and having talked with them till the break of day, departed.¹⁸⁹

§ 17. To gain time for this protracted farewell, Paul had sent his companions before him to the ship, and, while they doubled the promontory of Lectum, he took the shorter route by land to join them at Assos, whence they crossed to Mitylene (Monday, April 7th). Avoiding the windings of the coast, they sailed from Lesbos to Chios on the Tuesday, and on the next day to Samos, whence crossing over to the mainland, they stayed at the promontory of Trogyllium, and reached Miletus on Thursday, April 20th. Here they stopped, while Paul sent for the elders of the Church of Ephesus; for his direct course had carried him across the bay at the bottom of which that city lies; as the staying any time among his converts in Asia would have risked his purposed arrival at Jerusalem by the day of Pentecost.¹⁹⁰ The distance between Ephesus and Miletus being about forty miles, the interval from the Thursday to the Sunday would give time for the arrival of the elders, with whom Paul held solemn converse, as on the Sunday before at Troas (Sunday, April 23d). His farewell discourse to them is one of his representative addresses. It may be ranked with the Epistles, and throws the same kind of light upon St. Paul’s apostolical relations to the churches. Like several of the Epistles, it is in great part an appeal to their memories of him and of his work. He refers to his labors in “serving the Lord” among them, and to the dangers he incurred from the plots of the Jews, and asserts emphatically the *unreserve* with which he had taught them. He tells them that he was receiving inspired warnings, as he advanced from city to city, of the bonds and afflictions await-

¹⁸⁸ Acts xx. 10: comp. 1 Kings xvii. 21; 2 Kings iv. 34.

¹⁸⁹ Acts xx. 7-12. The words *ελάσας ἄρτον καὶ γευσάμενος* proba-

bly refer to two distinct acts, the sacramental supper followed by a meal.

¹⁹⁰ Acts xx. 13-16.

ing him at Jerusalem. It is interesting to observe that the Apostle felt it to be his duty to press on in spite of these warnings. Having formed his plan on good grounds and in the sight of God, he did not see in dangers which might even touch his life, however clearly set before him, reasons for changing it. Other arguments might move him from a fixed purpose—not danger. His one guiding principle was, to discharge the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God. Speaking to his present audience as to those whom he was seeing for the last time, he proceeds to exhort them with unusual earnestness and tenderness, and expresses in conclusion that anxiety as to practical industry and liberality which has been increasingly occupying his mind. His warnings of false teachers and heresies — “the grievous wolves who would *enter in* among them,” and “the men *of themselves* that would arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them” — anticipate the evils that we find rife at Ephesus, in the Epistles to Timothy and the Apocalypse. Finally, “he knelt down and prayed with them all: and they all wept sore, and fell on Paul’s neck, and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him to the ship.”

§ 18. From this most affecting leave-taking the Apostle hastened on his voyage by the most direct course. Embarking immediately on the close of his address, he sailed straight to the island of Cos (Monday, April 24th), thence to Rhodes (Tuesday), and thence to Patara in Lycia (Wednesday), where, finding another ship bound direct for Phœnicia, he went on board (Thursday, April 27th), and, sighting Cyprus on the left hand, arrived at Tyre, where the ship was to unload. The ordinary course of such a voyage would bring the Apostle to that ancient city on Sunday (April 30th); and another Lord’s Day was cheered by a welcome from certain disciples, of whose existence in the city he seems not to have been aware. With them he spent a whole week, in the course of which the prophetic gifts poured out upon these Tyrian Christians were used to warn Paul against going on to Jerusalem.¹⁹¹ How, in that one week, the Apostle gained

¹⁹¹ Acts xxi. 1-4. The words, “who said unto Paul *through the Spirit* that he should not go up to Jerusalem,” must not be misunderstood, as if the Apostle disobeyed a divine command in still going forward. His own teaching in the Epistles, concerning spiritual gifts, clearly shows the distinction between the supernatural knowledge conferred and the application made of it. The disciples, endowed by the Spirit

the affection of these new-found brethren, was proved by the concourse in which, with their wives and children, they brought him and his company out of the city to the sea-shore, where all kneeled down together and prayed before the voyagers went on board.

§ 19. Supposing that, as at Troas and Miletus, Paul spent the Lord's Day with the Tyrian Christians, his voyage to Ptolemais (Acre) would occupy the Monday, and his one day's stay there with the brethren, the Tuesday (May 9).¹⁹² On the following day Paul and his company proceeded, apparently by land, to Cæsarea, and took up their abode with "Philip the Evangelist, one of the Seven," a description which doubtless refers to those who are usually called Deacons.¹⁹³ The four virgin daughters of Philip prophesied, probably repeating former warnings, which were now most plainly uttered by Agabus, whom we have already seen predicting the famine in the reign of Claudius.¹⁹⁴ This prophet came down from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, apparently for the express purpose of staying Paul's course. Imitating the symbolic methods of the ancient prophets, he bound his own hands and feet with Paul's girdle, declaring, in the name of the Spirit, that the Jews at Jerusalem would even thus bind the owner of that girdle, and deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles. Upon hearing this, even St. Paul's own companions joined in the entreaties of the brethren of Cæsarea, that he would not go up to Jerusalem. The Evangelist, who tells us of this final appeal in which he himself joined, thus records its issue:—"Then Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? For I am ready, not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done."¹⁹⁵ So, after a stay of several days at Cæsarea, they packed up their little baggage, and went up, doubtless on foot, by the usual road to Jerusalem,¹⁹⁶ accom-

with the *prophetic knowledge* of Paul's coming dangers, would naturally add their own entreaties that he would avoid the danger. The fuller narrative of the similar scene at Cæsarea (vv. 10-14) puts the matter in its true light.

¹⁹² Acts xxi. 6, 7.

¹⁹³ Acts xxi. 8: comp. vi. 5. There can be no reasonable doubt that this "Philip the Evangelist" was the same who discharged that office for

the Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii.).

¹⁹⁴ Acts xi. 28.

¹⁹⁵ Acts xxi. 8-14: comp. Isaiah xx. 2, 8; Jer. xiii. 1-11. The prophecy derives, perhaps, the greater force from the fact that it was delivered at the place where Paul was kept a prisoner for two years.

¹⁹⁶ Acts xxi. 15, 16. The A.V. here uses the word *carriage*, for that which a traveler *carries*, as in Judg.

panied by an aged disciple of Cyprus, name Mnason, who had offered them a lodging in the crowded city.

§ 20. This fifth visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem since his conversion is the last of which we have any certain record. The state of the city, thronged with the excited multitudes who had come up to the Feast of Pentecost, might well recall to him, not only the warnings that had encountered him at every step, but the deed of blood in which he himself, twenty-five years before, had played the part for which he never ceased to feel remorse. He was welcomed with joy by the brethren, and on the following day (Thursday, May 18th) he had an interview with James and all the elders of the Church, to whom "he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry."¹⁹⁷ Among those things, besides the spiritual fruits which he had raised, the temporal fruits of charity which he had gathered in return for his poor Jewish brethren would naturally find a place, and we may assume that Paul and his delegated companions handed over the contributions from the respective churches. But St. Luke passes over this incident, to relate the events that led to the Apostle's apprehension; and, indeed, concern for his character and safety seems to have been the thought uppermost in the minds of the brethren. For the great crisis had now come in the relations between the spirit of Judaism and the Apostle of the Gentiles; nor was it only from the unconverted Jews that the danger threatened. The Jewish Christians, whether resident at Jerusalem or present at the feast, now amounted to "many thousands," but their understanding of the Gospel had not kept pace with their numbers: they were "all zealous of the law." To them, and to the unconverted Jews, Paul was known as one who had taught with pre-eminent boldness that a way into God's favor was opened to the Gentiles, and that this way did not lie through the door of the Jewish Law. He had founded numerous and important communities, composed of Jews and Gentiles together, which stood simply on the name of Jesus Christ apart from circumcision and the observance of the Law. He had thus roused

xviii. 21, 1 Sam. xvii. 22. The better reading is *ἐπισκευασάμενοι*, *having packed up*. Interpreting the *ἡμέρας πλείους* (ver. 10) by the Apostle's intention to reach Jerusalem at Pentecost, Mr. Lewin makes the stay at Cæsarea to have lasted from Wednesday, May 10th, to Sunday, May 14.

If Paul stayed, as at Troas, Miletus, and Tyre, to spend a farewell Lord's Day with the brethren, and started on the Monday, he would arrive at Jerusalem on the Wednesday (May 17th), on the evening of which day the feast began.

¹⁹⁷ Acts xvii. 17-19.

against himself the bitter enmity of that unfathomable Jewish pride, which was almost as strong in some of those who had professed the faith of Jesus as in their unconverted brethren. This enmity had for years been vexing both body and soul of the Apostle. He had no rest from its persecutions; and his joy in proclaiming the free grace of God to the world was mixed with a constant sorrow that in so doing he was held to be disloyal to the calling of his fathers. He had now come to Jerusalem "ready to die for the name of the Lord Jesus," but he had come expressly to prove himself a faithful Jew, and this purpose emerges at every point of the history. His brethren at Jerusalem now suggest to him a mode of accomplishing this object. While glorifying God for the work which had been done among the Gentiles, they do not conceal from Paul that the calumnies against him have gained belief among the Jewish Christians. The specific charge was, not simply that he kept Gentile believers free from the yoke of the Law—for this was in accordance with the decision of the Jewish Church itself—but that "he taught all *the Jews among the Gentiles* to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." To refute this charge, there was a practical opportunity.

Four men connected with the Church had bound themselves, as we have seen Paul himself doing, by a temporary Nazarite vow, and their purification upon the completion of the vow was at hand. This ceremony involved a considerable expense for the offerings to be presented in the Temple;¹⁹⁸ and it was a meritorious act to provide these offerings for the poorer Nazarites. St. Paul was requested to put himself under the vow with the other four, and to supply the cost of the offerings. He at once accepted the proposal, and on the next day, having performed some ceremony which implied the adoption of the vow, he went into the Temple, announcing that the due offerings of each Nazarite were about to be presented, and the period of the vow terminated,¹⁹⁹ a process which would occupy seven days (Friday, May 19).

The week was almost accomplished, when certain Jews from Asia, probably some of Paul's old antagonists at Ephesus, recognized him in the Temple. They had already seen with him in the city Trophimus, an Ephesian Greek, whom they chose to think that Paul had brought into the Temple.

¹⁹⁸ Num. vi. 13-21.—¹⁹⁹ Acts xxi. 17-26. Agrippa I. had ingratiated himself with the Jews by defraying these expenses for certain Nazarites

So they roused a tumult among the people, and set upon Paul with the cry:—"Men of Israel help! This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place: and further, brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place!" The whole city was raised: the people rushed together to the Temple, and, unwilling to defile it with blood, dragged Paul out from the court of the women into the outer court, the doors being immediately shut by the Levitical guard of the Temple.²⁰⁰ The Apostle's career would have been ended by a process more summary than that of Stephen, had not the alarming tidings been carried to the tribune in command of the Roman cohort²⁰¹ stationed in the fort Antonia, that all Jerusalem was in an uproar. Calling out a body of soldiers and centurions, he ran down into the Temple court, and at his appearance Paul's assailants stayed their blows. Having bound Paul with two chains, which fastened each of his arms to a soldier, and being unable to learn from the people's confused cries who he was and what he had done, he ordered him to be carried into the fort; but, on reaching the stairs, such a rush was made by the disappointed mob after their victim, that Paul had to be borne in the soldier's arms.²⁰²

This whole scene, and the vigorous measures of the tribune, will be better understood in their connection with the existing state of Judæa. The energetic but cruel government of Felix had goaded the disaffected Jews to desperation. In the preceding year (A.D. 57), the high-priest Jonathan had been murdered in the Temple; an act followed by the organization of the bands of terrorists called *Sicarii* or *Assassins*. Next after this murder, Josephus relates the appearance of an Egyptian impostor, who led out 4000 of these Assassins into the Desert,²⁰³ and, returning at the head of 30,000 men, whom he had deluded into the belief that he was the Messiah, and that he would restore the kingdom to Judah, he encamped on the Mount of Olives, threatening to overpower the Roman garrison, and promising that the walls of Jerusalem should fall down. He was attacked by Felix, and his followers dispersed or slain, the Egyptian himself escaping.²⁰⁴

²⁰⁰ Acts xxi. 27-30.

²⁰¹ Acts xxi. 31: τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης. The name of this officer, Claudius Lysias, which seems to imply a Greek freedman of the late emperor, is first mentioned in his letter to Felix, ch. xxiii. 26.

²⁰² Acts xxi. 31-36.

²⁰³ Acts xxi. 38, ἔξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἀνδρας τῶν σικαρίων, where our Version conceals both the force of the article τοὺς and the specific sense of the word σικαρίων.

²⁰⁴ Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 8, § 6; *B. J.* ii. 13, § 5. As Lysias evidently re-

The idea now occurred to Lysias that Paul was this Egyptian, and great was his surprise when his prisoner, just as they reached the entrance to the castle, addressed him *in Greek*, asking leave to speak with him. Paul removed his suspicion by telling him who he was:—"I am a Jew of Tarsus, in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city; and, I beseech thee, suffer me to speak unto the people." The permission was granted, and Paul, standing on the stairs, and having with a sign of his hand gained the silent attention of the people, began to address them: "Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defense now made unto you." As soon as they heard that he spoke in Hebrew, that is, in the then current Aramaic dialect of Palestine, the silence became the more profound, and Paul had at length the opportunity, to gain which was one motive of his pressing on to Jerusalem, of addressing the angry Jews in his own justification.²⁰⁵ His defense consists of a simple historical statement of the events of his own life, *as a Jew*,—born indeed at Tarsus, yet "brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and zealous toward God, as ye all are this day."²⁰⁶ How he had proved that zeal as a persecutor of the Christians, the high-priest and all the elders could bear him witness. He had been manifestly arrested in that course by the vision of Jesus of Nazareth, on the way to Damascus. We have already compared this with the other narratives of his conversion; but here we should observe how the present purpose of the Apostle explains what is special in this address. The great point is, that his course was changed by a direct operation upon his spirit from without, and not by the gradual influence of other minds upon his. Incidentally, we may see a reason for the admission that his companions "heard not the voice of him that spake to me" in the fact that some of them, not believing in Jesus with their former leader, may have been living at Jerusalem, and possibly present among the audience. Hence, too, he mentions that Ananias, who interpreted the will of the Lord to him more fully at Damascus, was a devout man according to the Law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt

fers to this insurrection as a recent event, and as such movements generally took place at the great festivals, it may be inferred as probable that this affair of the Egyptian occurred at the Passover of A.D. 58.

²⁰⁵ Acts xxii. 1, 2.

²⁰⁶ Acts xxii. 3. This is no mere conciliatory compliment, for Paul had recently expressed, in very earnest words, the same judgment of his countrymen: "I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge" (Rom. x. 2)

there, and that he made his communication in the name of Jehovah, the God of Israel. In the same spirit, he proceeds to relate that the next great revelation, that by which he received his full commission, was made to him as he was praying in the Temple, which he was falsely charged with profaning. There it was that, while he would gladly have prolonged his ministry at Jerusalem, he received the divine warning to make haste and depart, for they would not receive his testimony. He repeats to his hearers the argument which he had pleaded with the Lord himself—their knowledge of his persecution of the Christians and his consent to Stephen's death—as a reason why his testimony should be impressive at Jerusalem above all other places: but only to receive now the confirmation of the answer given to him then. The Lord had said, "Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles;"—and no sooner had he reached this point, than the storm of animosity burst forth anew. "They gave him audience unto this word:"—they could bear the name of the Nazarene, though they despised it; but the thought of that free declaration of God's grace to the Gentiles, of which Paul was known to be the herald, stung them to fury: they lifted up their voices, and said—"Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live!" Their cries were accompanied with frantic gestures; they cast off their clothes, as if to stone Paul, and threw dust into the air; and the tribune, ignorant of the language in which Paul had spoken, could only suppose that he had given some strong ground for such indignant fury. To learn what this was, he brought him into the castle, and commanded him to be examined by scourging. The soldiers were already binding him with thongs to the post, when Paul calmly asked the centurion in command, "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned?" The warning was forthwith carried by the centurion to the tribune, who, hastening to learn the truth from Paul, was more and more surprised to hear that the prisoner, on whom he had already inflicted the indignity of chains, was free-born, while he himself—doubtless as an imperial freedman, had only obtained the franchise for a large sum.²⁰⁷

Having now learned that the question at issue regarded the Jewish religion, the tribune summoned the chief priests and Sanhedrim to meet on the following day,²⁰⁸ when, having

²⁰⁷ Acts xxii.

²⁰⁸ Tuesday, May 23d, according to Mr. Lewin. The Sanhedrim probably met in the hall called *Garik*,

loosed Paul from his bonds, he placed him before them. We need not suppose that this was a regular legal proceeding. If, on the one hand, the commandant of the garrison had no power to convoke the Sanhedrim, on the other hand, he would not give up a Roman citizen to their judgment. As it was, the affair ended in confusion, and with no semblance of a judicial termination. St. Paul appears to have been put upon his defense; and, with the peculiar habit, mentioned elsewhere also, of looking steadily when about to speak,²⁰⁹ he began to say—"Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience"—or, to give the full force of the original,²¹⁰ "I have lived a conscientiously loyal life unto God, until this day,"—when a scene was enacted which is most interesting in a historical as well as a personal point of view.

ANANIAS, who presided over the Sanhedrim as high-priest, had been appointed to that office by Herod, king of Chalcis, in A.D. 48. In A.D. 52 he was sent to Rome by the prefect Ummidius Quadratus, to answer before Claudius on a charge of oppression brought against him by the Samaritans.²¹¹ The result is doubtful; but the best solution seems to be that Ananias was not formally deposed, but as, during his suspension, Jonathan had been appointed in his place, the latter had continued to exercise the office till his murder by the Sicarii in A.D. 57, when Ananias resumed his functions. The high-priest's character for violence and lawlessness²¹² suggests that a guilty conscience assumed the guise of zeal against blasphemy, when he at once interrupted Paul by ordering the by-standers to smite him on the mouth. "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall!" exclaimed the Apostle; "for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?"²¹³ The by-standers, who seem to have hesitated to execute the high-priest's hasty order, now remonstrated with the Apostle, "Revilest thou God's high-priest?" The apology of Paul, while proving his respect for the Law and its dignitaries, and his readiness to "render honor to whom honor was due, and custom to whom

which was divided from the stairs of the Antonia only by a narrow space of the Temple Court.

²⁰⁹ Acts xxiii. 1, ἀτενίσας: comp. Acts xiii. 9. The same word is used of the fixed attention with which the Sanhedrim regarded Stephen when before them (Acts vi. 15).

²¹⁰ περιπολιτεύμαι: comp. 2 Timothy 1:8.

²¹¹ Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 6, § 2.

²¹² Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 9, § 2.

²¹³ Besides the emphatic injunctions to judges to do no injustice, and not to condemn without a hearing (e. g. Lev. xix. 35, John vii. 51), there seems to be an allusion to the specific law regulating the infliction of blows on a man found worthy to be beaten (Deut. xxv. 2).

custom," has suggested the dilemma, How could he have been ignorant of the person and office of Ananias, who had been so long high-priest, and who was now conspicuous by his place and dress? how, if ignorant, could he have uttered a prophecy which was soon so strikingly fulfilled? An explanation, both natural in itself and agreeable to the grammar of the Greek text is, that Paul said, "I wist not, brethren, that *it was* the high-priest [who spoke]: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people:"—that, with his attention absorbed in his own thoughts, and also, it may be, from that defective sight, which some regard as his "thorn in the flesh," he heard the command, without noticing the quarter from which it came, and uttered a rebuke equally applicable to any member of that synod of judges who was guilty of such injustice. His indignation itself has been objected to on moral grounds, and even St. Jerome draws an unfavorable contrast between the vehemence of the Apostle and the meekness of his Master. But that Master has set the example of a righteous indignation in denouncing these very rulers; and his own comparison of them to "whited sepulchres" suggested the Apostle's image of a wall whose fresh-whitened surface concealed the rottenness which was tottering to its fall. On each of the many such hypocrites who sat before him, the Apostle might well denounce the doom, "God shall smite thee;" and there is no difficulty in regarding the special fitness of his words to Ananias—who was deposed by Felix and afterward murdered by the Sicarii—as one of the innumerable examples of unconscious prophecy.

It would seem that the high-priest's violence provoked remonstrances in the Sanhedrim itself; for so can we best explain the division which Paul perceived between the Sadducees and Pharisees. Seeing all chance of a fair hearing gone, he used this opportunity in a way for which he has again been censured on moral grounds. Those who are so keen to detect a disingenuous artifice, in the division which Paul's profession of faith stirred up, might have given him credit for considering the result of his open identification with the Pharisees, which assuredly brought him no permanent advantage. This is an *argumentum ad hominem*; but the true solution is to be found in the spirit of Paul's whole conduct during his visit to Jerusalem. He had not come thither to escape out of the way of danger; but, at the risk of bonds and death, to reconcile the sincere Jews, if possible, to the Gospel as the fulfillment of the Law. He desired to prove himself a faithful Israelite by his very testimony to Him whom God had raised.

from the dead. Both these objects might naturally be promoted by an appeal to the nobler professions of the Pharisees, whose *creed*, as distinguished from that of the Sadducees, was still, as it had ever been, his own. Of that creed, faith in the risen Lord was the true fulfillment. He wished to lead his brother Pharisees into a deeper and more living apprehension of their own faith; and seeing now the hopelessness of gaining over the Sadducees, he made a last appeal to the party of which there remained any hope. In the same honest spirit in which, on the previous day, he had declared his zeal for the Law, as a point of contact with his zealous countrymen, he now proclaimed his faith in the resurrection as the common ground on which he invited the Pharisees to join him; and those who object to the first clause of his speech should remember that its true force lies in the last clause:—"Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee: *of the hope and resurrection of the dead* I am called in question."²¹⁴ This view is fully confirmed by Paul's own allusion to the present scene in his defense before Felix, when he appealed to the Jews themselves to say whether they had found any offense in him as he stood before the Sanhedrim, "except for this one voice, which I cried standing among them, Touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question by you this day."²¹⁵ This is no apology for haste in uttering that cry, but the deliberate repetition of what he knew to be the true ground of the charge against him, just as he again told the Jews at Rome, "For *the hope of Israel* I am bound with this chain."²¹⁶

Paul's profession of faith caused dissension in the council, the Scribes of the Pharisees' party going so far as not only to declare him guiltless, but to renew the former suggestion of Gamaliel,—“What if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him?”^{216b} The tumult grew, till the tribune, fearing lest Paul should be torn asunder by them, sent the soldiers down to bring him back to the castle by force. In the night, after this agitating day, the Apostle was comforted by another vision of the Lord, who stood by him and said, “Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.”²¹⁷ So, then, he was

²¹⁴ Acts xxii. 6.²¹⁵ Acts xxiv. 21.²¹⁶ Acts xxviii. 20.^{216b} Acts xxiii. 9: εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος; This is the reading of the best MSS., the sen-

tence being perhaps broken off by the derision of the Sadducees at the idea of an angel speaking to Paul. The words μὴ θεομαχῶμεν are evidently a gloss imported from Acts vi. 39.

²¹⁷ Acts xxiii. 11.

to be guided by that unerring Hand, though by a path he had not proposed, to the goal he had so much desired; and we can understand the calmness which this assurance gave him amid the trials, imprisonment and shipwreck of the next two years.

His enemies, meanwhile, alarmed doubtless at the indecision of the Sanhedrim, resolved to end his course then and there.²¹⁸ The day had no sooner dawned than more than forty Jews bound themselves under a great curse, that they would eat nothing till they had slain Paul; and, going to the chief priests and elders, they desired them to ask the tribune to bring Paul again before the Sanhedrim on the morrow, when they would fall upon him and kill him. The plot became known to Paul's sister's son, who obtained admission to the castle to see his uncle, and, by his direction, informed the tribune of it privately. The latter having charged the young man to keep his secret, took instant measures to send Paul away by night under a sufficient guard. The morning saw him safe at Antipatris, beyond all danger of an ambush: so the legionaries returned to Jerusalem, and the cavalry alone brought him the same day to Cæsarea. With him a letter was sent from the tribune to the procurator Felix, explaining the case, informing him that the prisoner was a Roman citizen, and guiltless of any thing deserving death or bonds, and promising that Paul's accusers should follow him to Cæsarea.²¹⁹ From this letter we learn that the tribune was called Claudius Lysias, a name worthy to rank, for the fairness, energy and prudence of his dealings with St. Paul, among those soldiers who have made their profession honorable in the pages of the New Testament.

Antonius (who is also called Claudius) Felix, was an imperial freedman like Lysias; but, as we have already seen, a man of a very different character; and the mean vices, which he joined to his cruelty and arrogance, may be clearly seen in the few graphic touches in which Luke relates the procurator's treatment of the Apostle. For the present, he was content to ask Paul of what province he was; and, being answered, of Cilicia, he promised him a hearing as soon as his

²¹⁸ Wednesday, May 24th, according to Mr. Lewin. This vow of the forty Jews has its parallel in that of the Ten who conspired against Herod. (See p. 82).

²¹⁹ Acts xxiii. 12-30. The respect paid to a Roman citizen is seen in the credit which Lysias claims for rescuing Paul, "having understood that he was a Roman," and in his suppression of the fact that he only learned this when he was about to scourge him.

accusers should arrive. Meanwhile, he ordered the prisoner to be kept—chained probably to a soldier—in the government-house, which had been the palace (*prætorium*) of Herod the Great.²²⁰

§ 21. St. Paul was henceforth, to the end of the period embraced in the Acts, in Roman custody. This custody was in fact a protection to him, without which he would have fallen a victim to the animosity of the Jews. He seems to have been treated throughout with humanity and consideration. His own attitude toward Roman magistrates was invariably that of a respectful but independent citizen; and while his franchise secured him from open injustice, his character and conduct could not fail to win him the good-will of those into whose hands he came. Even Felix, convinced of the justice of the cause, and influenced by his Jewish wife Drusilla, treated him with consideration; but he showed at once his arbitrary character and that "*servile ingenium*" with which Tacitus has branded him, by keeping Paul a prisoner in the hope of obtaining a bribe for his release. Five days after Paul's arrival at Cæsarea, and just twelve since he had reached Jerusalem,²²¹ Ananias and the elders came down to Cæsarea, with a certain orator named Tertullus.²²² There is scarcely a more striking contrast in the records of oratory than that between the fulsome harangue of this hired advocate and the manly simplicity of St. Paul's defense. After addressing the governor with flattery which Felix must have felt to be bitter satire, Tertullus changes his tone to rank abuse when he comes to speak of Paul, showing exactly the light in which he was regarded by the fanatical Jews. He is a *pestilent fellow* (*λοιμός*); he stirs up divisions among the Jews throughout the world; he is a ringleader of the sect (or heresy, *αἰρέσις*) of the Nazarenes: his last offense had been an attempt to profane the Temple: and the orator complains that, when they would have judged him according to their law, the tribune Lysias had taken him violently out of their hands, commanding his accusers to appear before Felix, who might now examine them, and learn the charges they preferred.²²³ When the assenting clamor of the Jews had ceased, and the governor had beckoned to Paul to speak, he

²²⁰ Acts xxiii. 31-35.

²²¹ Acts xxiv. 1, 11: Tuesday, May 30th, according to Mr. Lewin. The second passage confirms Paul's arrival at Jerusalem just before the Pentecost.

²²² We have seen the custom of employing such professional advocates before the Roman tribunals, in the pleadings of Nicolaus Damascenus on behalf of Herod and Archelaus.

²²³ Acts xxiv. 1-9.

expressed his pleasure in making his defense before one who had been "for many years a judge unto this nation."²²⁴ It was only twelve days since he had come up to Jerusalem to worship; and with that simple object all his conduct there had been consistent. "They neither found me in the Temple disputing with any man, neither raising up the people, neither in the synagogues, nor in the city: neither can they prove the things whereof they now accuse me." He admits and glories in the charge of being a leader of what they called the Nazarene sect; for so he best preserved the religion of his nation:—"This I confess unto thee, after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers:"—and he again appeals to that hope, which even they allowed, of a resurrection of the dead. Because of this hope, he once more protests, he exercised himself to have always a conscience void of offense toward God and man. Acting upon such motives he had returned to Jerusalem, after an absence of several years,²²⁵ bringing alms and offerings to his nation. He had not even entered the Temple without being first purified, and there was no multitude nor tumult about him when the Jews of Asia found him there. *They* were absent, who ought to have been there if they had any charge to make; but to the Jewish rulers, who were present, he boldly appeals whether his sole offense was not that profession of faith in the resurrection which he had made before the council.

Felix saw the truth of Paul's case the more clearly as he had acquired a pretty exact knowledge of Christianity, which had gained its first Gentile converts among the troops stationed at Cæsarea.²²⁶ Unwilling, however, to offend the Jews by at once setting the Apostle free, he made an excuse for postponing the hearing till the arrival of the tribune Lysias, committing Paul to the custody of a centurion, with orders to grant him every indulgence and the society of his friends. Among those friends, besides Luke and Aristarchus, and the family of Philip the deacon, may have been Cornelius, the centurion, whom Peter had received into the Church, as the first Gentile convert, in that very garrison in which Paul was

²²⁴ Acts xxiv. 10. Felix had been appointed in A.D. 52; and the six years' interval might well be described as *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν*, in comparison with the ordinary duration of the procuratorship. At all events the period was long enough to have given Festus that familiarity with Jewish causes, to which Paul appeals.


²²⁵ Acts xxiv. 17: *δί' ἐτῶν δὲ πλείονων*. It was four years, or four and a half, since his last visit in A.D. 53 or 54.

²²⁶ Acts xxiv. 22: *ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ*: comp. Acts x.

now in a centurion's custody. It seems to have been to gratify the curiosity of his Jewish wife Drusilla, the daughter of Herod Agrippa I., that, on his return to Cæsarea after an absence, Felix again sent for Paul, to hear him concerning the faith in Christ. But the Apostle, who could at the proper time discourse with the most powerful arguments concerning Christian doctrine, now saw before him only the violent and unjust governor, with the paramour whom he had seduced from her husband Azizus, king of Emesa; and he reasoned of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come. A licentious Roman officer, with a brother able to protect him at the imperial court, was not the man to be easily alarmed; but a more mighty force even than his dread of Cæsar assailed his conscience; and he only retained the self-destructive power of warding off repentance by delay. "Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season, I will call for thee." It is a trite comment, that the convenient season never came; but the truth was worse than this. Felix often sent for Paul, and communed with him during the two years of his detention, but with no higher object than the sordid hope of being bribed to free him.

In the following year, the city of Cæsarea, where Paul was thus kept a prisoner, was the scene of one of the frequent and frightful tumults between the Jews and the Syrian Greeks, A.D. 59. Felix was denounced to the emperor for either ordering or conniving at a massacre of the Jews, and he was recalled to answer for his conduct at the same time that Domitian Corbulo succeeded Ummidius Quadratus as prefect of Syria. This was two full years after the beginning of St. Paul's imprisonment in May, A.D. 58, and Porcius Festus, who accompanied Corbulo as procurator of Judæa, would reach his destination about July, A.D. 60.²²⁷ How the arrival of the new governor obtained for Paul the hearing which Felix had so long postponed, and how the Apostle's appeal to Cæsar led to his imprisonment at Rome, will be related in the next chapter.

²²⁷ This, as we have already had occasion to observe, is one of the best ascertained dates in the life of St. Paul; since it is clear that Festus held the government for two years, and that Albinus succeeded him in A.D. 62.



Caesarea.

CHAPTER XVIII.

ST. PAUL'S FIRST IMPRISONMENT AT ROME. FROM HIS HEARING
BEFORE FESTUS TO HIS RELEASE—A.D. 60-63.

- § 1. Results of St. Paul's Imprisonment at Caesarea—Arrival of Porcius Festus as Procurator—Paul's first hearing—He appeals to Cæsar.
- § 2. Arrival of Agrippa and Bernice—Paul's *Defense before Agrippa*—Decision to send him to Rome.
- § 3. *The Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*—Minute truthfulness of the narrative, as tested by recent investigations.
- § 4. Routes of maritime traffic—Paul's embarkation under the charge of Julius—His companions, Aristarchus and Luke—The voyage commenced toward autumn.
- § 5. Intended course of the ship—Caesarea to Sidon—Adverse winds—Voyage to Myra—Transference to the ship of Alexandria.
- § 6. From Cnidus into the open sea, then under the lee of Crete—Fair Havens—The season of navigation past—Unheeded warning of St. Paul—Attempt to run for Port Phœnix.
- § 7. The ship caught in a typhoon (*Euroclydon*)—*Claudia*—Preparations against the storm—*Undergirding*—The *Syrtes*—The ship drifts on the starboard tack—Her course and rate.
- § 8. The fortnight's drift in Adria—St. Paul's vision in the night—Promise of escape.
- § 9. Signs of land—Anchoring during the night—Paul's last encouragement—

The dawn of day. § 10. Position of the ship in *St. Paul's Bay, Malta*—Running her on shore—The shipwreck and escape—St. Paul's former shipwrecks—His use of nautical images. § 11. The island of *MELITA (Malta)*: its people, and its primate Publius—Reception and miracles of St. Paul—He spends here the three winter months. § 12. Voyage from *Malta*, in the "Castor and Pollux," to *Syracuse, Rhegium* and *Puteoli*—Journey by land to *ROME*—The Christians meet Paul at *Appii Forum* and the *Three Taverns*. § 13. Paul delivered to the Prætorian prefect, *BURRUS*—His condition as a prisoner in the Prætorium—His two conferences with the Jews—Their rejection of the Gospel, terminating the first stage in the history of its foundation—Prophecy of their future restoration in the *Epistle to the Romans*—Paul preaches to the Gentiles—Conclusion of the *Acts*. § 14. St. Paul's two years' imprisonment at *Rome*—Causes for the delay of his trial—His labors and converts—Progress of the Gospel at *Rome*—His companions during his imprisonment: Luke, Aristarchus, Epaphras, Timothy, Mark, Demas, and Tychicus. § 15. Four Epistles written by St. Paul from *Rome*—*Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians*, at the same time, and somewhat earlier than *Philippians*. § 16. The Church at *COLOSSÆ*, and the *Epistle to the Colossians*—Corruptions from Judaism, angel-worship, and asceticism—The supreme headship of Christ. § 17. *ONESIMUS* and *PHILEMON*—Paul's *Epistle to Philemon*—His teaching concerning slavery. § 18. The *Epistle to the Ephesians*—Points in common with *Colossians*—Its special and sublime teaching. § 19. The *Epistle to the Philippians*—Paul's prospects at this time: his danger, resignation, and hope—Changes at *Rome*: Burrus, Seneca, Poppæa—Probable acquittal and release of the Apostle—Theory of a single imprisonment disproved. § 20. The *Epistle to the Hebrews* written at the close of Paul's first imprisonment—Internal proofs of Pauline authorship—Allusions to the persecution by Ananus in Judæa—The martyrdom of St. James—Indications of time and place, and of the writer's conditions and intentions—The writer is contemplating a visit to Jerusalem.

§ 1. THE whole career of the Apostle Paul is an illustration of that special providence of which he himself was assured by a series of divine revelations. Many an outburst of indignation has been provoked by the sordid injustice which kept him in prison for two years; many a sigh of regret upon reading the sentence, "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed to Cæsar."¹ But, as Paul's transference to Rome as a prisoner "fell out for the furtherance of the Gospel" at the very centre of Roman power,² so his detention in Roman custody at Cæsarea proved his protection not only from the murderous plots of the Jews, but from the bloody conflict between them and the Syrian Greeks in the very city where he was confined (A.D. 59). Nor is this the only reason that can be discovered for an interruption of two whole years in the last part of the Apostle's life. "As Paul might need the repose of preparation in Arabia, before

¹ Acts xxvi. 32.² Phil. i. 12-14.

he entered on his career, so his prison at Cæsarea might be consecrated to the calm meditation, the less interrupted prayer, which resulted in a deeper experience and knowledge of the power of the Gospel. Nor need we assume that his active exertions for others were entirely suspended. 'The care of all the churches' might still be resting on him; many messages, and even letters, of which we know nothing, may have been sent from Cæsarea to brethren at a distance. And a plausible conjecture fixes this period and place for the writing of Luke's Gospel under the superintendence of the Apostle of the Gentiles."⁵

At length the great Corbulo succeeded Ummidius Quadratus as prefect of Syria; and Felix, having been sent to Rome to answer the complaints of the Jews and Samaritans, was succeeded by PORCIUS FESTUS, whose arrival may be placed about the midsummer of A.D. 60.⁴ The procurator gave an earnest of his honest vigor by going up from Cæsarea to Jerusalem three days after his arrival.⁵ A new governor, anxious to gain favor with his subjects, was naturally assailed with petitions; and so Festus was now met by the chief priests and elders with urgent informations and demands for judgment against Paul.⁶ They entreated as a favor that Festus would send for him to Jerusalem, while they had laid an ambush to kill him on the way. Festus, without seeing through their plot, defeated it by keeping to his duty as a magistrate:—"It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him."⁷ So he told them that Paul should be kept at Cæsarea, whither he ordered the accusers to accompany him.⁸ He returned thither after ten days, and on the next day Paul was placed before the tribunal. The charges brought against him by the Jews from Jerusalem were many and grievous according to their law; but they were unable to prove them; and Paul was content to protest his innocence, "Neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple, nor yet against Cæsar, have I of-

⁵ Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. p. 354. Some have even supposed that the Epistles of "Paul the prisoner"—those to the *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, and *Philemon*—were written from Cæsarea; but internal evidence clearly refers them to Rome.

⁴ To remedy the abuse of newly-appointed prefects lingering at Rome,

an imperial edict had ordered them to set out before the 15th of April. A procurator generally accompanied his prefect, and the voyage to Syria occupied about three months (Lewin, *F. S.*).

⁵ Acts xxv. 1.

⁶ Acts xxv. 2, 15. *ἐνεφάνισαν . . . αἰτούμενοι κατ' αὐτοῦ δίκην.*

⁷ Acts xxv. 16. ⁸ Acts xxv. 5.

fended any thing at all." * The governor, fresh from Rome, and ignorant apparently of the interest which Christianity had excited even there, was surprised to hear nothing of the charges he had expected; but that, as he contemptuously tells Agrippa, they had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of *one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive*—an incidental proof of what we have seen before, that the controversy between Paul and his accusers turned upon the resurrection.¹⁰

This theological complexion of the case gave Festus an excuse for the proposal, which he really made in order to gratify the Jews, when he asked Paul whether he would go to Jerusalem and there be judged before him of these matters. Enough had transpired already of the murderous plots of the Jews to put the Apostle on his guard; and he had in his power a certain means of averting the danger of the governor's compliance—the *Cæsarem appello*—which was the ultimate safeguard of the Roman citizen. We can not but suppose that a sudden inspiration opened his eyes to the path by which he might be carried to the long-desired goal of his hopes at Rome. Once more, as at Philippi and in the Antonia, he asserts his rights with a dignified composure, which rebuked the judge's vacillation and reminded him of his limited power:—"I stand at *Cæsar's* judgment-seat, where I ought to be judged: to the *Jews* have I done no wrong, *as thou very well knowest*. For if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, *I refuse not to die*: but if there be none of these things whereof they accuse me, *no man may deliver me unto them*. I APPEAL UNTO CÆSAR."¹¹ These two bold words, uttered by a Roman citizen,

* Acts xxv. 6-8.

¹⁰ Acts xxv. 18, 19. From St. Paul's own account of the motives of his appeal (Acts xxviii. 18, 19) we may gather that his defense, and especially his vindication of the resurrection, called forth a clamorous demonstration from the Jews, which threatened—as in the case of Jesus before Pilate—to overbear the expressed intention of the procurator to let him go (ver. 18). "*But when the Jews spake against it, I was constrained to appeal unto Cæsar.*"

¹¹ *Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι*, the Greek equivalent for the Latin formula, *Cæsarem appello*, the mere utterance

of which, without any written process, made the appeal complete. The right of appeal (*provocatio*) in criminal cases from the sentence of a magistrate to the judgment of the whole body of his fellow-citizens was the privilege of every Roman, from the earliest period in the history of the state. Its remote origin is concealed under the beautiful legend of the appeal of the surviving Horatius from the sentence of death passed on him by King Tullus for his sister's murder (Liv. 1. 26); and its formal enactment, under the Republic, was the chief of the laws by which P. Valerius gained the surname of Poplicola

were a spell which a far less worthy magistrate would not have dared to resist; and Festus, after consulting with his assessors, had only to declare — “Thou hast appealed unto Cæsar. Unto Cæsar shalt thou go.” It is hardly clear whether these abrupt words indicate the procurator’s annoyance at having the decision taken out of his hands, in which he probably desired to do justice in the end, or his satisfaction at getting rid of a case difficult in itself, and likely to embroil him with the Jews at the very outset of his government.¹²

§ 2. The case before the procurator was now at an end; and it only remained to send the prisoner to Rome. While waiting for an opportunity, Festus had to draw up an account of the charge on which Paul was sent for trial; and it was no easy matter to place a mere question of Jewish “superstition” before Nero in a satisfactory form. He was in this difficulty, when Agrippa and his sister Bernice arrived at Cæsarea to congratulate the new governor. Several days were spent in ceremony and festivity before Festus mentioned the case of Paul to Agrippa, who, being informed by the governor of all that had passed, expressed a desire to hear the man. On the following day, Agrippa and Bernice took their seats on the tribunal beside Festus, with that royal pomp to which Luke refers as an eye-witness, surrounded by the military tribunes and the chief men of the city; and Paul, bound by a chain to his warder, was set before them. Not withholding his judgment that the prisoner had done nothing worthy of death, Festus explained the motive for this renewed hearing, namely, to avail himself of the advice of the king and the council as to what precise charge he ought to lay be-

(B.C. 508). Like the British *Magna Charta*, it was confirmed on several occasions, the most important being its re-enactment by M. Valerius, after the right had been taken away by the Decemvirs (B.C. 449). There was, however, a distinction between this *provocatio ad populum*, which implied a previous sentence, and the *appellatio*, by which a citizen invoked the power of a magistrate, and especially the aid of a tribune (the *tribunicium auxilium*) to protect him from a wrong, whether inflicted, or only threatened. But, as the emperors united in themselves the ancient privileges of the people and the powers of the tribunes (*trib-*

unicia potestas), the two kinds of appeal were naturally confounded; and there is nothing surprising in Paul’s appeal before Festus had given judgment. In relation, also, to Festus’s proposal that the case should be transferred to Jerusalem, Paul may perhaps be regarded as appealing from the mixed authority of the Jewish and Roman courts to the pure Roman law at its fountain-head.

¹² Acts xxv. 9-12, 20, 21. The narrative of St. Luke (in verses 1-12) should be carefully compared with Festus’s own account of the matter to Agrippa in verses 14-22.

fore Augustus :—" Wherefore I have brought him forth before you, and especially before thee, O king Agrippa, that, after examination had, I might have somewhat to write. For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not withal to signify the crimes laid against him."¹³ Such was the occasion given to the Apostle to "bear the name of Jesus before Gentiles and before kings;" and to this audience, composed of all that was most august both of the Jews and Romans at Cæsarea, he pronounced the most memorable and impressive of his great apologies for Christian truth, and for his own mission as the Apostle to the Gentiles, a point on which he now fitly lays especial stress, while vindicating also his consistency as a faithful Jew.

In this discourse,¹⁴ we have the second explanation from St. Paul himself of the manner in which he had been led, through his conversion, to serve the Lord Jesus instead of persecuting his disciples, and the third narrative of the Conversion itself. Speaking to Agrippa as to one thoroughly versed in the customs and questions prevailing among the Jews, Paul appeals to the well-known Jewish and even Pharisaical strictness of his youth and early manhood. He reminds the king of the great hope which continually sustained the worship of the Jewish nation,—the hope of a deliverer, promised by God himself, who should be a conqueror of death. He had been led to see that this promise was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth; he proclaimed his resurrection to be the pledge of a new and immortal life. What was there in this of disloyalty to the traditions of his fathers? Did his countrymen disbelieve in this Jesus as the Messiah? So had he once disbelieved in him, and had thought it his duty to be earnest in hostility against his name. But his eyes had been opened: he would tell how and when. The story of the Conversion is modified in this address as we might fairly expect it to be. We have seen that there is no absolute contradiction between the statements of this and the other narratives. The main points,—the light, the prostration, the voice from heaven, the instructions from Jesus,—are found in all three. But in this account, the words "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest" are followed by a fuller explanation, as if then spoken by the Lord, of what the work of the Apostle was to be. The other accounts defer this explanation to a subsequent occasion. But when we consider how fully the mysterious communication made at the moment of the Conversion in-

¹³ Acts xxv. 13-27.¹⁴ Acts xxvi.

cluded what was afterward conveyed, through Ananias and in other ways, to the mind of Paul, and how needless it was for Paul, in his present address before Agrippa, to mark the stages by which the whole lesson was taught, it seems merely captious to base upon the method of this account a charge of disagreement between the different parts of the history. They bear, on the contrary, a striking mark of genuineness in the degree in which they approach contradiction without reaching it. It is most natural that a story told on different occasions should be told differently; and if in such a case we find no contradiction as to the facts, we gain all the firmer impression of the substantial truth of the story. The particulars added to the former accounts by the present narrative are, that the words of Jesus were spoken in Hebrew, and that the first question to Saul was followed by the saying, "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads." (This saying is omitted by the best authorities in the 9th chapter.) The language of the commission, which St. Paul says he received from Jesus, deserves close study, and will be found to bear a striking resemblance to a passage in Colossians.¹⁵ The ideas of light, redemption, forgiveness, inheritance and faith in Christ, belong characteristically to the Gospel which Paul preached among the Gentiles. Not less striking is it to observe the older terms in which he describes to Agrippa his obedience to the heavenly vision. He had made it his business, he says, to proclaim to all men "that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance:"—words such as John the Baptist uttered, but not less truly Pauline.^{15b} And he finally reiterates that the testimony on account of which the Jews sought to kill him was in exact agreement with Moses and the prophets. They had taught men to expect that the Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles. Of such a Messiah Paul was the servant and preacher.¹⁶

At this point Festus began to apprehend what seemed to

¹⁵ Col. i. 12-14.

^{15b} Compare Paul's language at Athens, p. 479.

¹⁶ "There never was any that understood the Old Testament so well as St. Paul, except John the Baptist, and John the Divine. . . . Oh, he dearly loved Moses and Isaiah, for they, together with King David, were the chief prophets. The words and

things of St. Paul are taken out of Moses and the prophets." (Luther's *Table Talk*, cccxxviii., English Translation.) Another striking remark of Luther's may be added here: "Whoso reads Paul may, with a safe conscience, build upon his words; for my part, I never read more serious writings." (*Table Talk*, xxiii.)

him a manifest absurdity. He interrupted the Apostle discourteously, but with a compliment contained in his loud remonstrance. "Thou art mad, Paul; thy much learning is turning thee mad." The phrase τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα may possibly have been *suggested* by the allusion to Moses and the prophets; but it probably *refers* to the books with which St. Paul had been supplied, and which he was known to study, during his imprisonment. As a biographical hint, this phrase is not to be overlooked. "I am not mad," replied Paul, "most noble Festus: they are words of truth and soberness which I am uttering." Then, with an appeal of mingled dignity and solicitude, he turns to the king. He was sure the king understood him. "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." The answer of Agrippa can hardly have been the serious and encouraging remark of our English version. Literally rendered, it appears to be, You are briefly persuading me to become a Christian; and it is generally supposed to have been spoken ironically. "I would to God," is Paul's earnest answer, "that whether by a brief process or by a long one, not only thou but all who hear me to-day might become such as I am, with the exception of these bonds:"¹⁷—he was wearing a chain upon the hand he held up in addressing them. With this prayer, it appears the conference ended. Festus and the king, with their companions, consulted together, and came to the conclusion that the accused was guilty of nothing that deserved death or imprisonment. And Agrippa's final answer to the inquiry of Festus was, "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar."

§ 3. At each step in the record of the *Acts*, we have found some fresh occasion to admire the exact knowledge and truthfulness of the writer, as confirmed by every incidental allusion that he has occasion to make. Indeed, if the life of St. Paul is of itself a sufficient moral evidence of the truth of Christianity, the narrative of his labors by St. Luke is a critical evidence no less conclusive. And as the former has been summed up in the narrow issue of Paul's conversion, so we might even be content to stake the latter on the story of his voyage and shipwreck.¹⁸ It is just where a landsman makes the most ridiculous exposure of his ignorance, that the historian has ventured on details as minute as those of a Marryat or a Cooper,

¹⁷ Acts xxvi. 28, 29. The precise subject of much discussion. The meaning of the ἐν ὀλίγῳ of Agrippa, and the answering καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ of Paul, has been the best MSS. have ἐν μεγάλῳ instead of ἐν πολλῷ.
¹⁸ Acts xxvii.

but with the addition of other allusions to matters of fact, as to places, seasons, winds, and currents; without, in either case, exposing one single flaw to the keenest professional criticism. Of this there can be but one explanation: that, being an eye-witness of all the incidents, and an observer as intelligent as he was honest, he simply recorded in plain words what he saw and heard. Nor can we doubt that the Spirit, under whose guidance he wrote, led him to place these minute details upon the record, expressly to afford a test of that record itself; and we have reason for devout thankfulness that the test has been most thoroughly applied, and most satisfactorily borne, in our own time.¹⁹ The result of this investigation has been that several errors in the received version have been corrected, that the course of the voyage has been laid down to a very minute degree with great certainty, and that the account in the Acts is shown to have been written by an accurate eye-witness, not himself a professional seaman, but well acquainted with nautical matters.

§ 4. The Roman empire had no packet service, nor were ships of war usually employed for the transport of prisoners from the provinces to Rome. But for such a purpose, as well as for ordinary passengers, ample opportunities were furnished by the great lines of commercial traffic over the seas which had been long since effectually cleared of pirates. There were the main lines, of which the most important, in the East, was that of the vessels that carried the corn of Egypt from Alexandria to Italy, and particularly to the port of Puteoli; and it was in two such ships that Paul made the chief portions of his voyage.²⁰ Then there was the coasting trade, which (in the Levant) was chiefly conducted by the

¹⁹ The investigation of St. Paul's voyage and shipwreck, from this point of view, has been made independently by two writers, whose labors combine the practical knowledge of the seaman with the judgment of the non-professional critic, availing himself of all the results of nautical and hydrographical science. (1.) The late Admiral Sir CHARLES PENROSE entrusted his MSS. on the subject to Dr. Howson; (2.) ALEXANDER SMITH, Esq., of Jordanhill, has discussed every point with the most minute and masterly criticism in his *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* (1848), besides revising the twenty-third

chapter of Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*, which contains a complete summary of the whole matter. Mr. Lewin has examined the chronological details with his usual care, and his dates are given in the text as the best approach to certainty that can be attainable in such calculations.

²⁰ Dr. Howson cites examples of the use of such merchant vessels even by imperial personages. It was in merchant ships that Vespasian sailed from Alexandria to Rhodes, and thence to Greece, and that Titus afterward sailed from Alexandria, touching at Rhegium and Puteoli, like Paul in his voyage from Malta.

Greeks of Asia Minor, of whose vessels we have already seen Paul making use. It was in such a ship, belonging to Adramyttium,²¹ that he now set sail, with other prisoners, under the care of Julius, a centurion of the Augustan cohort, whose conduct in the sequel entitles him to a place among the military worthies of the New Testament.²² The number of the prisoners appears to have been considerable; and, from the then state of Judæa, we may infer that there were among them leaders of the Sicarii, and other fierce fanatics, who would be no friendly company for Paul. But he was cheered by the society of "the beloved physician," and of the Thessalonian Aristarchus, his constant fellow-traveler, who had accompanied him from Macedonia, and now became his fellow-prisoner at Rome.²³ That the voyage was commenced about the end of summer, in order to reach Italy before winter, is evident from the subsequent mention of the Great Fast.²⁴

²¹ Adramyttium, or Atramyttium, was a sea-port in the province of Asia, situated in the district anciently called Æolis and also Mysia. (See Acts xvi. 7.) Adramyttium gave and still gives its name to a deep gulf on this coast, opposite to the opening of which is the island of Lesbos. St. Paul was never at Adramyttium, except perhaps during his second missionary journey, on his way from Galatia to Troas (Acts xvi.), and it has no Biblical interest, except as illustrating his voyage from Cæsarea in the ship belonging to this place (Acts xxvii. 2). The reason is given in what follows, viz., that the centurion and his prisoners would thus be brought to the coasts of Asia, and therefore some distance on their way toward Rome, to places where some other ship bound for the west would probably be found. Ships of Adramyttium must have been frequent on this coast, for it was a place of considerable traffic. It lay on the great Roman road between Assos, Troas, and the Hellespont on one side, and Pergamus, Ephesus, and Miletus on the other, and was connected by similar roads with the interior of the country. According to tradition, Adramyttium was a settle-

ment of the Lydians in the time of Croesus: it was afterward an Athenian colony: under the kingdom of Pergamus, it became a sea-port of some consequence; and in the time of St. Paul Pliny mentions it as a Roman assize-town. The modern *Adramyti* is a poor village, but it is still a place of some trade and ship-building.

²² Acts xxvii. 1. The "Augustan cohort" was probably a detachment of the Prætorian Guards attached to the person of the governor of Cæsarea. Julius is supposed to have been the same as Julius Priscus, who rose from the rank of centurion to that of Prætorian Prefect (Tac. *Hist.* ii. 92, iv. 11).

²³ Acts xix. 29, xx. 4; Philem. 24; Col. iv. 10. It seems clear that Aristarchus was involved in the same charge with Paul; but whether this was so with Luke is concealed by that habitual reticence with which he forbears to claim any share in the Apostle's labors and sufferings. His modesty has had its reward in the testimony of Paul, and in the holy fame of the writer of the Gospel and of the Acts.

²⁴ The following is Mr. Lewin's calculation:—Festus arrives about mid-

§ 5. The ship, in which Julius embarked with his prisoner, intended to touch at several places on the coast of proconsular Asia, on the way to her own port of Adramyttium; ²⁶ but an opportunity might offer, even sooner, of finding some vessel bound direct for Italy, at one of the Lycian ports (Patara or Myra) or at Cnidus, where the lines of traffic met. Launching from Cæsarea, they touched on the following day at Sidon, where, by the kindness of Julius, who doubtless already saw the difference between Paul and his other prisoners, he was permitted to visit his friends and received their affectionate care.²⁷ Here the delays of the voyage began with contrary winds,—doubtless the W. and N.W. winds which prevail during the late summer, directly in the teeth of their proper course for Patara or Cnidus, past the south of Cyprus. So they sailed under the lee of that island, and through the seas of Cilicia and Pamphylia; where, beside the lands winds moderated by the shelter of the chain of Taurus, they would have the aid of the current which sets N.W. and W. past the eastern point of Cyprus and along the south coast of Asia Minor into the Ægæan. Thus they reached the port of Myra in Lycia, where they fell into the great line of the Egyptian corn-trade, and found a corn-ship of Alexandria bound for Italy; and to this vessel Julius transferred his prisoners.²⁷

summer, June 24. Goes to Jerusalem after 8 days, say 2 for the journey; stays there more than 10 days (say 14 with the return); hears Paul (1 day); the interval before Agrippa's visit (say 10 days) and the "several days" of festivity (say 7 days); the hearing before Agrippa (1 day); the preparations for the voyage 20 days: in all 58 days, bringing us to August 21st for the sailing from Cæsarea. Of course the dates are only meant to be approximate.

²⁶ Acts xxvii. 2. μέλλοντες πλεῖν τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους ἀνήχθημεν, where the first person may indicate the usual identification of the passenger with his vessel rather than the intended route of Julius and Paul.

²⁷ Acts xxvii. 3; ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν. The distance from Cæsarea to Sidon is 67 miles. Paul may have visited the city during his early labors in Syria and Cilicia.

²⁷ Myra, with its fine harbor at Andriace, on the same meridian as Alexandria, seems to have been a usual rendezvous for ships bound from Egypt to Italy, when the winds were contrary. A captain in the merchant service informed Dr. Howson that *in coming from Alexandria in August*, he has stood to the north toward Asia Minor for the sake of the current, and that this is a very common course. Mr. Lewin supposes that Julius had intended to keep in the Adramyttian ship, and that the unexpected presence of the Alexandrian ship at Myra caused him "most unluckily to change his plan," and to adopt the direct course, with the risks of a late season, in preference to the safer route by the Ægæan and across the Isthmus. From the number of passengers on board this ship of Alexandria, and making allowance for her not being a transport, but a merchantman heavily laden, Admiral

§ 6. The voyage was very slow as far as Cnidus, at the S.W. headland of Caria,²⁸ where "they lost the advantages of a favoring current, a weather-shore, and smooth water, and encountered the full force of the adverse wind as they opened the Ægæan." They made Cnidus with difficulty, and, finding it impossible to pursue their direct course for Cythera (off the southern point of Peloponnesus) against the N.W. wind, they ran down to the southward, and, doubling Sal-mone, the eastern headland of Crete, they beat up with difficulty under the lee of the island, as far as the fine harbor, near Lasæa, which still bears its ancient name of the *Fair Havens*.²⁹ Beyond this the coast runs out to the south in the headland of *Cape Matala*, on doubling which they would have met the full force of the N.W. wind over an open sea and on a lee shore; so that they were altogether wind-bound, and remained here a long time.

Meanwhile the navigation had grown dangerous, for it was past the season of the Great Jewish Fast (the Day of Atonement), which fell this year exactly at the autumnal equinox (Sept. 23d), the limit fixed by ancient writers to sea voyages. Paul now interposed the first of his warnings, in terms which imply that he spoke under divine guidance, as well as with much former experience of "perils in the sea:"³⁰ "Sirs, I perceive that this voyage will be with hurt and much damage, not only of the lading and ship, but also of our lives." But the centurion, with whom the decision rested, preferred the judgment of the owner and the master of the ship.³¹ Fair

Penrose calculates her burden at upward of 500 tons.

²⁸ Cnidus is mentioned in 1 Macc. xv. 23, as one of the Greek cities which contained Jewish residents in the second century before the Christian era. It was a city of great consequence, situated at the extreme S.W. of the peninsula of Asia Minor, on a promontory now called *Cape Crio*, which projects between the islands of Cos and Rhodes (see Acts xxi. 1). *Cape Crio* is in fact an island, so joined by an artificial causeway to the mainland as to form two harbors, one on the N., the other on the S. The latter was the larger, and its moles were noble constructions. All the remains of Cnidus show that it must have been a city of great magnificence.

²⁹ Acts xxvii. 7, 8. Καλοὶ Λίμενες, now Διμεόνες Καλοῦς. The ruins of Lasæa, still bearing the same name, were discovered by a yachting party in 1856. Mr. Lewin calculates the voyage from Sidon to Cnidus at not less than a month, and thence to Fair Havens about a week, bringing us to about the 26th of September.

³⁰ 2 Cor. xi. 26.

³¹ "That St. Paul was allowed to give advice at all implies that he was already held in a consideration very unusual for a prisoner in the custody of soldiers." (Howson.) That slavery to the letter which finds a contradiction between the Apostle's first warning and the ultimate saving of every soul on board, is best answered by reference to the passage, "*God hath given thee all them that sail with thee*"

Havens was incommodious to winter in, and the majority advised attempting to run for Phoenix, a harbor sheltered alike from the N.W. and S.W. winds, and described by modern sailors as the only secure harbor, in all winds, on the south coast of Crete.²²

§ 7. It was about the 18th of October when the mariners were tempted out of Fair Havens by a soft south wind, which would enable them to double *C. Matala* (only 5 miles distant), and then to make a fair run of 35 miles to Port Phoenix. They had already weathered the cape, and were keeping close under the land,²³ when, without a moment's warning, an E.N.E. wind came sweeping down the gullies of Mount Ida, "descending from the lofty hills in heavy squalls and eddies" with all the fury of a typhoon. The sailors, accustomed to those seas, recognized their dreaded enemy by its well-known name *Euroclydon*. Unable to bear up into the wind,²⁴ they could only let the ship scud before the gale.²⁵

(ver. 24). Their lives were really forfeit to the commander's rashness, but they were given back to the Apostle's prayers.

²² Phoenix is called *Phenice* by our translators, who perhaps meant the word to be pronounced *Phénice*, in two syllables, as distinguished from *Phénice* (i. e., *Phœnicia*, Acts xi. 19). The name is doubtless derived from the Greek word for the palm-tree, which was indigenous in Crete. The positions assigned by Ptolemy and Pliny, the preservation of the name *Phinika* in the neighborhood, and the proximity of *Clauda*, concur with other evidence to identify the harbor with *Lutro*, where, contrary to the former opinion that there was no safe anchorage on the south coast of Crete, the survey of 1852 found excellent soundings, combined with a perfect shelter from the whole compass of the westerly winds. This fact concurs with the very purpose of the mariners, to prove that the words βλέποντα (*looking*, not *lying* as in the A.V.) κατὰ Λίβα καὶ κατὰ Χῶρον can not possibly mean *exposed* to the S.W. and N.W. winds. This description is not that of St. Luke himself, who never entered the harbor, but that of the sailors, who spoke from their own

point of view; and the harbor, viewed from the sea toward the land which encloses it, would look toward the S.W. and N.W. Or, as Mr. Smith suggests, κατὰ may mean *down the direction* of the winds blowing from those quarters. (See the argument more fully stated by Dr. Howson, with the chart and soundings of *Lutro*, St. Paul, c. xxiii.)

²³ Acts xvii. 13. ἄσσον παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην, where the Vulgate has strangely (and quite wrongly) transformed the comparative adverb into a proper name, *cum sustulissent de Asson, legebant Cretam*.

²⁴ ἀντοφθαλμεῖν, literally *into the wind's eye*.

²⁵ Acts xxvii. 14, 15. Μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλε κατ' αὐτῆς (sc. Κρήτης) ἄνεμος τυφωνικὸς, ὃ καλούμενος Εὐροκλύδων (Vulg. *Euroaquilo*, i. e., *north-easter*, a Latin name which the Greek sailors not understanding might easily convert the ending into κλύδων, a *billow*; and some of the best MSS. have Εὐρακίλων). That κατ' αὐτῆς means "down from the land of Crete," and not "against it" (i. e., the ship, A.V. and Smith), is a grammatical necessity, and Admiral Penrose (as quoted in the text) saw this meaning even without refer

In this course they were carried under the lee of a small island named *Clauda*, about 20 miles from the coast of Crete.³⁶ Under its shelter they got the boat on board, always a difficult matter in a gale," and especially when it was doubtless full of water. This could only be done at all by bringing the ship's head round to the wind, a fact of which the importance will presently appear. The next preparation is one of the most interesting points in the whole narrative; "they used helps, *undergirding* the ship." The ancient ships were peculiarly liable to loosen their frame-work and start their planks, not only from the imperfections of their build, but from the strain upon the hull caused by the single mast with its large square-sail. Hence the frequent foundering at sea, of which we have other cases in the shipwreck of Jonah, and in that of Josephus on his way to Rome four years later, which forms a striking parallel to the voyage of St. Paul.³⁸ As a precaution against this danger, ships were provided with cables or chains, which could be passed round the hull at right angles (not, as some have supposed, from stem to stern), as "helps" to its strength, the ends being secured on deck; and this was the process described as "undergirding

ence to the Greek. The whole account of the sudden burst and long continuance of the typhoon is wonderfully confirmed by modern voyagers. Captain Spratt, R.N., after leaving Fair Havens with a light southerly wind, fell in with "a strong northerly breeze, blowing direct from Mount Ida." Next, the wind is described as being like a typhoon or whirlwind (*τυφωνικός*, A. V. "tempestuous"); and the same authority speaks of such gales in the Levant as being generally "accompanied by terrific gusts and squalls from those high mountains." It is also observable that the change of wind is exactly what might have been expected; for Captain J. Stewart, R.N., observes, in his remarks on the Archipelago, that "it is always safe to anchor under the lee of an island with a northerly wind, as it dies away gradually, but it would be extremely dangerous with southerly winds, as they almost invariably shift to a violent northerly wind" (Pardy's *Sailing Directory*, pt. ii. p. 61). The long

duration of the gale ("the fourteenth night," ver. 27), the overclouded state of the sky ("neither sun nor stars appearing," ver. 20), and even the heavy rain which concluded the storm (*τὸν ἑταρόν*, xxviii. 2) could easily be matched with parallel instances in modern times (Smith, *Voyage and Shipwreck*, pp. 97, 144; Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. pp. 401, 412).

³⁶ The position of *Clauda* is nearly due west of *C. Matala*, and nearly due south of Phœnix.

³⁷ Acts xxvii. 16: *ἰσχύσαμεν περικατεῖς γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης, ἣν ἄραυτες*, etc. These words seem to imply that the passengers helped. The sailors, in their confidence of a short and smooth run to Phœnix, had left the boat to tow astern. It is worth while observing that this large Alexandrian corn-ship, with 276 souls on board, seems to have had only one boat.

³⁸ Virgil, himself a voyager, assigns this cause for the loss of the fleet of Æneas, "*Laxis laterum compagibus omnes*" (*Æn.* i. 122).

the ship.”³⁹ Another motive for this precaution was the risk that, in that narrow part of the Mediterranean, the ship should be driven across to the Libyan coast, and fall upon the quicksands of the Great Syrtis,⁴⁰ where the undergirding would delay her going to pieces.


To keep the vessel from this dangerous course, and to make her more steady, they “lowered the gear, and so were driven.”⁴¹ This can not mean that the ship scudded before the wind; for that course would have driven her right on the Syrtis, if she had not first been swamped by the sea breaking over her stern; but that she lay to under a storm-sail with her starboard (or right) side to the wind, the very position in which she had been brought up to the wind to take the

³⁹ Acts xxvii. 17: βοηθείας ἐχρῶντο, ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον. The process is in the English navy called *frapping*, and many instances could be given where it has been found necessary in modern experience. Ptolemy's great ship carried twelve of these undergirders (ὑποζώματα); and they are mentioned in the inscriptions giving an inventory of the Athenian navy. Various allusions to the practice are to be found in the classical writers (e. g. Thuc. i. 29; Plat. *Repub.* x. 3, p. 616; Hor. *Od.* i. 14. 6). On the first of these passages Dr. Arnold observes that “the Russian ships taken in the Tagus in 1808 were kept together in this manner, in consequence of their age and unsound condition.”

⁴⁰ Acts xxvii. 17: φοβούμενοί τε μὴ εἰς τὴν Σύρτιν ἐκπέσωσι (A. V. *quicksands*), the broad and deep bight on the North African coast between Carthage and Cyrene. The name is derived from *Sert*, an Arabic word for a desert. For two reasons this region was an object of peculiar dread to the ancient navigators of the Mediterranean, partly because of the drifting sands and the heat along the shore itself, but chiefly because of the shallows and the uncertain currents of water in the bay. So notorious were these dangers, that they became a commonplace with the poets (see Hor. *Od.* i. 22, 5; Ov. *Fast.* iv. 499; Virg. *Æn.* i. 111; Tibull. iii. 4, 91;

Lucan, *Phars.* ix. 431). It is most to our purpose here, however, to refer to Apollonius Rhodius, who was familiar with all the notions of the Alexandrian sailors. In the 9th book of his *Argonautica*, 1232-1237, he supplies illustrations of the passage before us, in more respects than one—in the sudden violence of the terrible north wind, in its long duration, and in the terror which the sailors felt of being driven into the Syrtis. There were properly two Syrtes—the eastern or larger, now called the *Gulf of Sidra*, and the western or smaller, now the *Gulf of Gabes*. It is the former to which our attention is directed in this passage of the Acts. The best modern account of this part of the African coast is that which is given (in his *Memoir on the Mediterranean*, pp. 87-91, 186-190) by Admiral Smyth, who was himself the first to survey this bay thoroughly, and to divest it of many of its terrors.

⁴¹ χαλάσαντες τὸ σκεῖος οὕτως ἐφέροντο. In ver. 30, the word χαλασάντων is used again for *letting down* the boat by *loosening* her tackle. The meaning here seems to be that the large square-sail was let down on deck, together with the heavy top-hammer of ropes and pulleys (σκεῖος) that held it up. The extra fair-weather sails, if such there were, would either have been taken in or carried away at the beginning of the hurricane.



boat on board."⁴³ This manœuvre would keep her head well off the African coast, and cause her to drift a little to the N. of W. at the rate of about a mile and a half an hour, or 36 miles a day. The next day they began to lighten ship, by throwing overboard all that could be spared;⁴⁴ and on the day after, the passengers helped to cast out the spare gear that had already been sent down on deck.⁴⁵

§ 8. All was now done that the best seamanship of that age could suggest, and there followed the far more trying interval of suspense for several days, the tempest continuing at its height, and neither sun nor stars appearing to give them an idea of their position.⁴⁶ All hope of safety was now abandoned.⁴⁷ "No one," says Dr. Howson, "who has never been in a leaking ship in a continued gale can know what is suffered under such circumstances. The strain both of mind and body—the incessant demand for the labor of all the crew—the terror of the passengers—the hopeless working at the pumps—the laboring of the ship's frame and cordage—the driving of the storm—the benumbing effect of the cold and wet—make up a scene of no ordinary confusion, anxiety, and fatigue. . . . To this despair was added a further suffering from want of food, in consequence of the injury done to the provisions, and the impossibility of preparing any regular meal. Hence we see the force of the phrase which alludes to what a casual reader might suppose an unimportant part of the suffering, that there was *much abstinence*."

But under that dark sky, and in that hopelessly drifting ship, there appeared the light of joy and life; for it held no Jonah, fleeing from duty, but a Paul bound in spirit to testify

⁴³ We must refer to Mr. Smith's work (pp. 64, 65) for the technical details in proof that the ship lay to on the starboard tack. As to the position of the ship's head, it is calculated that an ancient merchantman could commonly sail in fair weather within 7 points ($78\frac{1}{2}^\circ$) of the wind, and she could probably lie to at the same angle. If, then, the wind was E.N.E., or 6 points E. of N., her head would now be 1 point W. of N., or N. by W. (but with that "coming up and falling off" which causes a ship lying to to oscillate over an arc of from 5 to 9 points). Adding 6 points for "leeway," the ship in this position would drift W. by N., in a direct course for Malta.

⁴⁴ Acts xxvii. 18; ἐκβολὴν ἐποιοῦντο (the Imperfect). The valuable cargo of wheat was not thrown out till the last emergency (ver. 38). Compare Jonah i. 5.

⁴⁵ Ver. 19, where the word αὐτόχειρες and the change from the third person to the first indicate the part taken in the work by Luke, and no doubt by Paul himself. Mr. Smith supposes the σκευὴν here to be the mainyard, "an immense spar, probably as long as the ship, which would require the united efforts of passengers and crew to launch overboard."

⁴⁶ This overcast sky is frequent during a "Levanter."

⁴⁷ Acts xxvii. 20.

for God also at Rome. As in so many a former crisis of his life, a vision was vouchsafed to him in the night; and, when another day broke, as dark and hopeless as those before, he announced the good news to the sailors and passengers gathered round him on the deck. After gently reminding them of the claim which his former rejected advice gave him to their belief, he went on in the kindly words:—"And now I exhort you to be of good cheer: for there shall be no loss of any man's life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the *ANGEL OF GOD, whose I am and whom I serve*, saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar: and lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer; for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me. Howbeit, we must be cast upon a certain island."⁴⁷ The same power that gave this assurance could have caused the ship to arrive safe in port with her cargo as well as her crew; but it is the law of God's providential discipline that the deliverances he grants from the consequences of our errors should be at the expense of that degree of suffering but for which they would pass unvalued, and that those who have received such deliverances should remain

"Thankful for all God takes away,
Humbled by all he gives."

§ 9. The storm still raged with unabated fury, and the ship was drifting in the sea of *Adria*,⁴⁸ when, on the fourteenth night after their departure from Clauda, some of those indications which a sailor's ear detects so quickly—doubtless, as

⁴⁷ Acts xxvii. 21-26.

⁴⁸ More properly *Adrias* (ὁ Ἀδρία). The word seems to have been derived from the town of *Adria*, near the Po; and at first it denoted that part of the Gulf of Venice which is in that neighborhood. Afterward the signification of the name was extended, so as to embrace the whole of that gulf. Subsequently it obtained a much wider extension, and in the apostolic age denoted that natural division of the Mediterranean which Humboldt names the Syrtic basin (see Acts xxvii. 17), and which had the coasts of Sicily, Italy, Greece, and Africa for its boundaries. This definition is explicitly given by almost a contemporary of St. Paul, the geographer Ptolemy, who also says that

Crete is bounded on the west by *Adrias*. Later writers state that Malta divides the Adriatic sea from the Tyrrhenian sea, and the isthmus of Corinth the Ægean from the Adriatic. Thus the ship in which Josephus started for Italy, about the time of St. Paul's voyage, foundered in *Adrias* (*Life*, 3), and there he was picked up by a ship from Cyrene and taken to Puteoli (see Acts xxviii. 13). It is through ignorance of these facts, or through the want of attending to them, that writers have drawn an argument from this geographical term in favor of the false view which places the Apostle's shipwreck in the Gulf of Venice. (*Smith's Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul. Diss. on the Island Melita.*)

we shall soon see, the roar of breakers—gave a warning of land near, which the soundings confirmed. Fearing to be driven on the rocks, they cast four anchors out of the stern, and “longed for day-break.”⁴⁹ For in such a storm, to anchor off a lee shore is a forlorn hope; and the sailors conspired to desert the ship by letting down the boat, on the pretense of casting more anchors out of the prow. Paul once more interposed with words which furnish a marked illustration of the working of human effort with divine decrees. These sailors were still wanted for the last act of seamanship in the morning; and the same voice that had promised, in God’s name, that not a life should be lost, now said to Julius, “Except these abide in the ship ye can not be saved.” The soldiers cut the ropes by which the sailors were already lowering the boat, and the last visible means of safety was swept away into the darkness.⁵⁰

All were now shut up to the unknown escape which the Apostle had promised; and this last act of decision seems to have given him that ascendancy over the crew which he had already secured over the soldiers and all the rest. As the day began to break, he gathered around him his fellow-voyagers (276 souls in all), and besought them to eat after their fourteen days’ fast, as it was needful for their salvation⁵¹ to be strengthened for the last exertions; and once more he assured

⁴⁹ Acts xxvii. 27-29: *ἡύχοντο ἡμέραν γενέσθαι*. The ancient anchors, as we see on coins, were similar in form to our own (except that the flakes were not barbed), and the cables passed in a similar manner through hawse-holes (the pair in the prow being called *eyes*). Ships of any size had several: here we have four, and elsewhere eight (Ath. v. 43). The most powerful anchor, the “last hope,” was called the *sacred* (*ιερά, sacra*), and persons trying their last hope were said *sacram solve* (whence the impressive figure in *Hebrews* vi. 19). The ship anchored by the stern (a course common with the ancients, and for which they would therefore be prepared), not only as the best means of checking her course and preventing her swinging round on to the rocks, but to be in readiness to run ashore as soon as day-light enabled them to choose a proper spot. As to the holding-ground afforded

by *St. Paul’s Bay* in Malta, we are told that, “while the cables hold, there is no danger, as the anchors will never start” (Purdy’s *Sailing Directions*, p. 180). Nelson anchored his fleet by the stern both at the Nile and Copenhagen; and, after the latter battle, he stated that *he had been that morning reading the 27th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles* (Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. p. 414).

⁵⁰ Acts xxvii. 30-32.

⁵¹ Acts xxvii. 33-34. *τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει*. (Our translators have been, as so often, misled by the Vulgate, *pro salute vestra*, taking *salus* as *health*, instead of *salvation*). The phrase, *τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτην σήμερον ἡμέραν προσδοκῶντες ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε* must of course be understood in the sense that they had no regular meal, probably munching grains of the wheat or other damaged provision, as they could get them.

them, "there shall not an hair fall from the head of any one of you." "When he had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all; and when he had broken it, he began to eat. Then were they all of good cheer, and they also took some food."⁶² Surely the Evangelist's use of language so similar to the Gospel record of the Lord's Supper indicates more than a "grace before meat," and goes far to justify our putting the highest sense upon the words—"God hath given thee—as a *gift of grace*"—all those that sail with thee." Dr. Howson observes of Paul's former address:—"Sailors, however reckless they may be in the absence of danger, are peculiarly open to religious impressions: and we can not doubt that they gathered anxiously round the Apostle, and heard his words as an admonition and encouragement from the other world, that they were nerved for the toil and difficulty which was immediately before them, and prepared thenceforward to listen to the Jewish prisoner as to a teacher sent with a divine commission;" and so we venture to regard that breaking of bread as an eucharistic feast, in which—as we infer from the numbers being mentioned just here—none on board failed to share.⁶⁴

They ate with a good appetite,⁶³ and thus refreshed in body, mind, and soul, they used the first dawn to lighten the ship by casting out the cargo of wheat into the sea, "to enable them by a lighter draft of water either to run into any small harbor, or at least closer in with dry land, should they be obliged to run the ship on the rocks or beach."⁶⁶ This took some time; and now that it was broad day-light, the sailors could examine the shore. At first they did not recognize it as known land;⁶⁷ but they saw what appeared to be a creek or bay, with a smooth beach,⁶⁸ into which they decided, if possible, to run the ship.

⁶² Acts xxvii. 35, 36.

⁶³ Acts xxvii. 24, *κεχάρισται σοι*.

⁶⁴ Acts xxvii. 37.

⁶⁵ Acts xxvii. 38: *κορεσθέντες* (being satisfied) *τῆς τροφῆς*.

⁶⁶ Penrose MS., quoted by Howson, vol. ii. p. 419. Another motive was to get rid of a part of the burden which, from the ship having been so long on the starboard tack, had shifted to the port side, in order to bring her upright, and enable her to be more accurately steered toward the land at day-break. (Smith and Penrose, *ibid.*). Some take τὸν σῖτον

to mean the remnant of their provisions, the cargo having either been already thrown out (ver. 18), or being too much to be dealt with now; but surely this would not materially "lighten the ship" (*ἐκούφιζον τὸ πλοῖον*, ver. 38). *Κορεσθέντες τῆς τροφῆς* seems to be the antecedent, not to what they did with the food now superfluous, but to the effort needed to cast out the cargo.

⁶⁷ Acts xxvii. 39: *τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἐπεγίνωσκον* (Imperfect); contrasted with the *ἐπέγνώμεν* below (Acts xxviii. 1).

⁶⁸ *Κόλπον τινα ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν*.



Chart of part of the coast of Malta.

§ 10. What followed is explained by looking at the spot, thus far unknown to them, but now identified beyond any reasonable doubt. The perverse ingenuity which, misled first by the word *Adria* (ver. 27), proceeded to discover a *MELITA* high up the Dalmatian coast of the Adriatic, raised a contro-

versy which has been completely settled. The island was unquestionably *Malta*; and it is almost equally certain that the scene of the shipwreck was that to which local tradition has given the name of *St. Paul's Bay*, on the N.E. coast of the island. The direction of the ship's head when she lay to off *Clauda*, and her estimated rate of drift, were just such as to carry her to *Malta* in the fourteen days, and she could make *St. Paul's Bay* without first touching any other part of the island, which from this point trends to the S.E. A glance at the chart is of itself enough to show how her course was guided by that *special providence* which so plainly announced itself to Paul.⁵⁹ The ship was borne in the darkness so near to *Koura Point*, the S.E. headland of the bay, that the breakers striking its rocks gave the warning to anchor just in time to avoid striking on the opposite shore; and the soundings are precisely those mentioned in the narrative.⁶⁰ She anchored off the E. point of the islet of *Salmonetta*, which would appear from that point of view to join the mainland, with its beach of sand or mud.

The preparations to run in the ship sustain the character of the Alexandrian mariners for seamanship. "While cutting the anchors adrift, they unloosed the lashings with which the rudder had been secured, that they might steer freely, and hoisted the foresail, both to steady the vessel's course and to press her further on upon the land. These three things were done simultaneously (*ἅμα*), and there were a sufficient number of hands on board."⁶¹ Thus they drove right ashore, stem on,

⁵⁹ In this case, at least, those who would merge a *particular* in a *general* providence have no choice but to reject the truth of St. Paul's vision. But, in truth, history, philosophy, and consciousness unite to teach that the former doctrine is the necessary complement of the latter; and he best vindicates the permanence and universality of God's laws who vindicates their administration, in individual cases, by God's wisdom and love.

⁶⁰ Namely, about 20 fathoms off the point, and 15 further on (Acts xxvii. 28). The anchor in the chart indicates about the place where the ship was brought up.

⁶¹ Acts xxvii. 40. Dr. Howson. The following points in the narrative require elucidation:—(1.) They "loosed the rudder-bands" (*ἀνέντες*

τὰς ζευκτηρίας τῶν πηδαλίων). The ships of the ancients were not steered, like ours, by a single rudder hinged on at the stern, but by a pair of broad-bladed oars or paddles, each acting in a rowlock or through a port-hole, according as the ship was small or large. This fact is made familiar to us by coins and sculptures; those, for example, on Trajan's column. Nor was this the case only with the ancient ships that navigated the Mediterranean, but with the early ships of the Northmen, as may be seen in the Bayeux tapestry. Traces of the two rudders are found in the time of Louis IX.; and the hinged rudder first appears on the coins of King Edward IV. Hence the steering apparatus of the ancient ships was named in the *plural*,

and the bow stuck fast on the muddy beach. But then it proved that the spot they had mistaken for the bottom of a creek was at the mouth of the little strait separating the islet of *Salmonetta* from the mainland, "a place where two seas met."⁶² The swell of the open sea, rolling in from the north through this channel, dashed the hinder-part of the ship to pieces; but the fore-part, fixed "upright and immovable,"⁶³ afforded a refuge to the voyagers while preparing to escape to shore. A new danger now arose from the savage temper of the Roman soldiers, who would have killed the prisoners, lest any of them should swim ashore and escape.⁶⁴ Even the centurion would probably have seen nothing strange in such an act; but, for the sake of saving Paul, he prevented its execution; and, assuming the command with that military discipline which we have so often seen triumphant over the confusion of a shipwreck, Julius ordered that those who could swim should first plunge into the sea and get to land; while the rest followed as best they could, some on spars, and some on pieces of the wreck: "and so it came to pass that they all escaped safe to land."⁶⁵

πηδάλια, gubernacula. There is nothing inconsistent with this in James iii. 4, where *πηδάλιον* (*helm*) occurs in the singular, for the Apostle is speaking of the smallness of the *instrument* (a paddle-rudder) with which the steersman (*ὁ εἰθύνων*) governs the ship—generally, by the bye, moving each separately. In the case before us, when four anchors were let go at the stern, it would of course be necessary to lash or trice up both paddles, lest they should interfere with the ground-tackle. When the ship had to be steered again, and the cables were cut, the lashings of the paddles would of course be unfastened. (2.) They "*hoisted up the mainsail to the wind*" (*καὶ ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμονα*)—a manœuvre which would astound a sailor, especially as there can be little doubt that the mainyard and its rigging had been thrown overboard. In fact the *ἀρτέμων* was the *foresail*, carried on a small foremast, which may be seen raking over the bow in representations of ships on Roman coins. Such a sail would be almost necessary in putting a large ship about. On this occasion it was used

in running her aground. Dr. Howson most appositely quotes the following from a letter in the *Times*, Dec. 5, 1855: "H.M.S.—, off the Katcha, Nov. 15.—The *Lord Raglan* (merchant-ship) is on shore, but taken there in a most sailor-like manner. Directly her captain found he could not save her, he cut away his mainmast and mizen, and, *setting a top-sail on her foremast, ran her ashore stem on.*"

⁶² Acts xxvii. 41. *Περιπεσόντες δὲ εἰς τόπον δὴθάλασσαν*: the very word that Strabo applies to the Bosphorus. "Though we are not to suppose that by *two seas* two moving bodies of water or two opposite currents are meant, yet it is very possible that there might be a current between *Salmonetta* and the coast, and this affected the steering of the vessel" (Howson).

⁶³ *ἐρείσασα ἀσάλευτος*. Mr. Smith, whose investigations extended to the geology of Malta, describes the bottom at this spot as of mud, graduating into tenacious clay.

⁶⁴ Acts xxvii. 42, *μήτις ἐκκολυμβήσας* literally, *diving out*) *διαφύγη*.

⁶⁵ Acts xxvii. 44.

As to Paul himself, it was not the first time that he had had such an escape from even greater dangers. Long before this time he tells the Corinthians of his three shipwrecks, in one of which he had passed "a night and a day on the deep," floating about probably on a spar, like Josephus when shipwrecked in this very Adrian Sea.⁶⁶ Nor will it be out of place here to observe how, with this experience, and ministering so constantly among sea-faring Greeks, he makes a most impressive though unfrequent use of nautical images. The fate of those apostates who, swerving from the direct course of good conscience and faith unfeigned, which guides to perfect love, have "made shipwreck concerning faith,"⁶⁷ may be contrasted with the Apostle's repeated avowal uttered in the port of Miletus, as he was hastening on his voyage to Jerusalem, that he had never "furled his sails in the onward course of declaring all the counsel of God:"⁶⁸ and we may well suppose that the remembrance of the night when his ship rode out the storm in the Maltese bay, with her straining cables passed out into the darkness, suggested the image of the Christian's sole but certain hope, "which we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that which is within the veil."⁶⁹

§ 11. And now, like the shipwrecked mariners, we are once more on firm land, after this intricate but most interesting voyage. They had not recognized the land at first, but—says St. Luke—"When we had escaped, then we discovered that the island was called MELITA."⁷⁰ Malta was at this time a dependency of the province of Sicily, governed by an officer who is mentioned on inscriptions by the very title given to him by St. Luke, of *Primus*.⁷¹ From its position in the

⁶⁶ 2 Cor. xi. 25.

⁶⁷ 2 Tim. i. 5, 6, 19.

⁶⁸ Acts xx. 20 and 27: οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλάμην. The δρόμος of ver. 24 also may refer to a voyage as well as to a race-course.

⁶⁹ Heb. vi. 19. This and Acts xxvii. are the only passages of the N. T. in which the word *anchor* occurs.

⁷⁰ Acts xxviii. 1.

⁷¹ Πρωτος Μελιτᾶων (Acts xxviii. 7). Mr. Smith could not find these inscriptions. There seems, however, no reason whatever to doubt their authenticity (see Bochart, *Opera*, i. 502; Abela, *Descr. Melitae*, p. 146,

appended to the last volume of the *Antiquities* of Graevius; and Boeckh, *Corp. Insc.* vol. iii. 5754). Through subsequent periods of its history, Vandal and Arabian, Malta was often associated with piracy. The Christianity, however, introduced by St. Paul was never extinct. This island had a brilliant period under the knights of St. John; and it is associated with the most exciting passages of the struggle between the French and English at the close of the last century and the beginning of the present. No island so small has so great a history, whether Biblical or political.

Mediterranean, and the excellence of its harbors, Melita has always been important both in commerce and war. It was a settlement of the Phœnicians at an early period, and their language, in a corrupted form, continued to be spoken there in St. Paul's day.⁷² From the Carthaginians it passed to the Romans in the Second Punic War. It was famous for its honey and fruits, for its cotton fabrics, for excellent building-stone, and for a well-known breed of dogs. A few years before St. Paul's visit, corsairs from his native province of Cilicia made Melita a frequent resort. This one fact is enough to prove that the island was then thinly peopled, and consequently it may have been well-wooded. The extraordinary increase of its population in modern times accounts for the disappearance of many indigenous animals that once harbored in its forests, and disposes of the objection that no venomous snakes are now found in the island.

The inhabitants received the shipwrecked mariners with kindness, and kindled a fire, which was most needful in the cold and rain.⁷³ Paul was helping to gather sticks, and had just laid a bundle on the fire, when a viper, driven out by the heat, fastened on his hand.⁷⁴ Possessed with a superstition, not extinct in our day, about the safety from one death of those who deserve another, and knowing Paul to be a prisoner, the natives said among themselves, "At all events this man is a murderer, whom, saved from the sea, justice suffereth not to live." But when, after Paul had quietly shaken off the reptile into the fire, they watched a long time in vain to see him swell or fall down dead, they changed their minds and said that he was a god,—a conclusion the more natural from the belief of a people of Eastern origin in serpent-worship and serpent-charming.⁷⁵ The incident not only gave Paul that ascendancy over the people which we well know how he would use, but it would naturally attract the attention of Publius, the primate of the island, whose estates were in the neighborhood. He received the Apostle's party with courteous hospi-

⁷² Gesenius, *Versuch üb. malt. Sprache*, Leipz. 1810. Hence the people are called *βάρβαροι* (Acts xxviii. 2), which simply means that they did not speak Greek, and is unfortunately translated *barbarous people* in the A.V.

⁷³ Acts xxviii. 2. Mr. Lewin calculates that the date was about the 1st of Nov.

⁷⁴ Acts xxviii. 3. This *ἐχίονα* was

probably the common viper (*Pelias berus*), which is widely distributed throughout Europe and the islands of the Mediterranean, or else the *Vipera aspis*, a not uncommon species on the coasts of the same sea.

⁷⁵ Acts xxvii. 3-6. St. Luke doubtless gave his readers credit for inferring, from Paul's conduct at Lystra, how he would act now in rejecting divine honors.

talities;⁷⁶ and was rewarded by the cure of his father, who lay ill of fever and dysentery, through the prayer of Paul with the laying on of his hands. The fame of the miracle spread through the island, and others who had diseases came and were healed. We can not doubt that these miracles were followed by the preaching and belief of the Gospel, through the winter months, during which Paul and his companions were detained in Malta by the suspension of navigation. His success is attested by the honors paid to him in the island, and the supplies with which he was loaded on his departure.⁷⁷

§ 12. After a detention of three months, Julius placed his prisoners on board another Alexandrian ship, the "Castor and Pollux," which had wintered in the island.⁷⁸ About the beginning of February (A.D. 61)⁷⁹ they sailed first to Syracuse, where they remained three days; and thence they beat up⁸⁰ to Rhegium on the Italian side of the straits of Messina. After a day's waiting for the weather, a fair south wind sprang up, and carried them on the following day to their destination at Puteoli, one of the chief ports for the corn-trade, and therefore for the landing of passengers.⁸¹ As

⁷⁶ Acts xxviii. 7. By the *τρεῖς ἡμέρας* of this passage we may probably understand that after the Apostle had stayed with Publius three days, the miracle of healing caused the people to begin to resort to him, and he entered on a course of evangelic labor throughout the island.

⁷⁷ Acts xxviii. 10.

⁷⁸ Acts xxviii. 11. The ancients placed their ships under the protection of tutelar deities, whose images were either placed as a figure-head, which was the usage of the Phœnicians, or (as Cyril tells us was the constant custom of the Alexandrians) sculptured or painted on each side of the prow (Lucian, *Navig.* c. 5; Hor. *Carm.* i. 14, 10, 14, "Non dî, quos iterum *pressa voces malo*. . . . Nil *pictis* timidus navita *puppibus* fidit"). The Dioscuri were especially the tutelar deities of mariners, to whom they appeared in heaven in the constellation Gemini (fratres Helenæ, *lucida sidera*), and played about ships in those electric lights which modern sailors call the Fire of St. Elmo (Hor. *Carm.*

i. 3, 2, iv. 8, 31). Hence this ship of Alexandria had them for its "sign" (*παράσημον*).

⁷⁹ Mr. Lewin assigns Feb. 8th, that being the date when navigation was resumed.

⁸⁰ This is Mr. Smith's explanation of *περιελθόντες*, Acts xxviii. 13.

⁸¹ Puteoli (*Ποτίολοι*) appears thus also in Josephus (*Vit.* 3; *Ant.* xvii. 12, § 1, xviii. 7, § 2). It was at that period a place of very great importance: the celebrated bay which is now "the Bay of Naples," and in early times was "the Bay of Cumæ," was then called "Sinus Puteolanus." The city was at the north-eastern angle of the bay. Close to it was Baiæ, one of the most fashionable of the Roman watering-places. The emperor Caligula once built a ridiculous bridge between the two towns; and the remains of it must have been conspicuous when St. Paul landed at Puteoli. In illustration of the arrival here of the corn-ships we may refer to Seneca (*Ep.* 77) and Suetonius (*Octav.* 98). The earlier name of

might have been expected at a port in such constant communication with the East, they found here Christian brethren, at whose desire Paul spent a week with them, the centurion being evidently eager to show him unbounded courtesy—"And so went on to Rome."⁸²

These words imply that they followed the usual route trodden by so many travelers—

"Prætors, Proconsuls, to their provinces
Hasting, or on return, in robes of state;
Lictors and rods, the ensigns of their power,
Legions and cohorts, turms of horse and wings;
Or embassies from regions far remote,
In various habits, on the *Appian Road*."⁸³

How many of these travelers must have looked down upon the Apostle and his escort with the same feelings with which we regard the weary, dismal march of a chained gang of con-

Puteoli, when the lower part of Italy was Greek, was Dicæarchia. Josephus speaks of himself (after the shipwreck which, like St. Paul, he had recently gone through) as διασωθεὶς εἰς τὴν Δικαιαρχίαν ἣν Ποτιόλους Ἰταλοὶ καλοῦσιν. The word Puteoli was a true Roman name, and arose (whether a *puteis* or a *putendo*) from the strong mineral springs which are characteristic of the place. Its Roman history may be said to have begun with the Second Punic War. It rose continually into greater importance, from the causes above mentioned. No part of the Campanian shore was more frequented. The associations of Puteoli with historical personages are very numerous. Scipio sailed from hence to Spain. Cicero had a villa (his "Puteolanum") in the neighborhood. Here Nero planned the murder of his mother. Vespasian gave to this city peculiar privileges; and here Hadrian was buried. In the 5th century Puteoli was ravaged both by Alaric and Genseric, and it never afterward recovered its former eminence. It is now a fourth-rate Italian town, still retaining the name of *Pozzuoli*. In connection with St. Paul's movements, we must notice its communications in Nero's reign along the mainland with Rome. The coast-

road leading northward to Sinuessa was not made till the reign of Domitian; but there was a cross-road leading to Capua, and there joining the Appian Way. The remains of this road may be traced at intervals; and thus the Apostle's route can be followed almost step by step. We should also notice the fact that there were Jewish residents at Puteoli. We might be sure of this from its mercantile importance; but we are positively informed of it by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. 12, § 1) in his account of the visit of the pretended Herod-Alexander to Augustus; and the circumstance shows how natural it was that the Apostle should find Christian "brethren" there immediately on landing. The remains of Puteoli are considerable. But our chief interest here is concentrated on the ruins of the ancient mole, which is formed of the concrete called *Pozzolana*, and sixteen of the piers of which still remain. No Roman harbor has left so solid a memorial of itself as this one at which St. Paul landed in Italy.

⁸² Acts xxviii. 14.

⁸³ Milton's *Paradise Regained*, bk. iv. vv. 63-68. Horace has left us a vivid account of his journey along this great thoroughfare (*Sat.* i. 5). See note 81.

victs; little dreaming that he came a truer conqueror than any general who had led his legions along that road to enter Rome in triumph. He had another greeting before his journey's end. "The Italian Christians had long been looking for a visit from the famous Apostle, though they had not expected to see him arrive thus, a prisoner in chains, hardly saved from shipwreck" (Howson). The stay at Puteoli had given time for the news of his arrival to be sent to Rome; and the Christians of that city sent to meet him as far as the stations of *Appii Forum* and the *Three Taverns*.⁸⁴ This double welcome was the earnest that Paul's long desire, both to preach the Gospel at Rome and to have fellowship with the Church already founded there,⁸⁵ was now to be fulfilled; and, when he saw them, he thanked God, and took courage.

§ 13. It must be remembered that this whole journey was made in custody of the centurion, who, on reaching Rome, delivered up his prisoners to the prefect of the Prætorian Guard,⁸⁶ who was at this time the celebrated Burrus. The

⁸⁴ APPII FORUM (Ἀππίου φόρον) was a very well known station (as we learn from Hor. Sat. i. 5, and Cic. ad Att. ii. 10) on the Appian Way, the great road which led from Rome to the neighborhood of the Bay of Naples. The position of this place is fixed by the ancient Itineraries at 43 miles from Rome (*Itin. Ant.* p. 107; *Itin. Hier.* p. 611). The Jerusalem Itinerary calls it a *mutatio*. Horace describes it as full of taverns and boatmen. This arose from the circumstance that it was at the northern end of a canal which ran parallel with the road, through a considerable part of the Pomptine Marshes. There is no difficulty in identifying the site with some ruins near *Treponti*; and in fact the 43d mile-stone is preserved there. The name is probably due to Appius Claudius, who first constructed this part of the road.

THREE TAVERNS (Τρεῖς Ταβερναί: *Tres Tabernæ*) was the next station on the Appian Road. The distances, reckoning southward from Rome, are given as follows in the *Antonine Itinerary*:—"To Aricia 16 miles; to Three Taverns, 17 miles; to Appii Forum, 10 miles;" and, comparing this with what is observed still along

the line of road, we have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that "Three Taverns" was near the modern *Cisterna*. Just at this point a road came in from Antium on the coast. This we learn from what Cicero says of a journey from that place to his villa at Formiæ (*Att.* ii. 12). There is no doubt that "Three Taverns" was a frequent meeting-place of travelers. Paul met here a second group of Christians. A good illustration of this kind of intercourse along the Appian Way is supplied by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. 12, § 1) in his account of the journey of the pretender Herod-Alexander. He landed at Puteoli (*Dicæarchia*) to gain over the Jews that were there; and "when the report went about him that he was coming to Rome, the whole multitude of the Jews that were there went out to meet him, ascribing it to Divine Providence that he had so unexpectedly escaped."

⁸⁵ Rom. i. 15.

⁸⁶ Acts xxviii. 16: τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ. The use of the *singular* here, viewed in connection with St. Luke's habitual accuracy, furnishes Mr. Lewin with a confirmatory proof of the time of St. Paul's arrival at Rome.

report of Julius, and in some degree probably the interest already excited about Christianity at the imperial court, procured special favor for St. Paul. Though still, like state prisoners even of the highest rank (as in the case of Agrippa under Tiberius), having one arm bound to the soldier who kept him night and day, with that chain to which he makes touching allusions,⁸⁷ he was suffered to dwell by himself in his own hired house, of course within the precincts of the *Prætorium*,⁸⁸ and what he valued far more—to receive visitors and discourse freely with them of the Gospel.

Beginning here also with his own nation, the Apostle, three days after his arrival, invited the chief men among the Jews to come to him, and, addressing them as *brethren*, he freely explained to them his present position. Though innocent of any crime against the Jewish law or customs, he had been given at Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans, and when they were ready to acquit him, the opposition of the Jews had constrained him to appeal to Cæsar. He was now at

We have seen that the date of his hearing before Festus may be placed, by independent evidence, in A.D. 60. The course of his journey brings him to Rome in *March*, which must have been *not later than* A.D. 62; for he preached without molestation for two full years, and the great persecution of the Christians broke out in the latter part of A.D. 64. But further, Burrus died in Jan. A.D. 62, and after his death there were two Prætorian Prefects, and their custody of state prisoners is spoken of in Plin. *Epist.* x. 66 (*Vinctus mitti ad Præfectos Prætorii mei debet*). This then agrees with the former date, to fix St. Paul's arrival at Rome to *March*, A.D. 61.

⁸⁷ Acts xxviii. 20; Eph. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20; Philem. 10, 13; and so in his second imprisonment (2 Tim. i. 16, ii. 9). This was called the *custodia militaris*.

⁸⁸ Acts xxviii. 30. This explains Phil. i. 13: "My bonds in Christ are manifest in the whole *Prætorium* (not *palace*, as in A.V.), and in all other places," or as some interpret, "to all the rest." The Prætorian camp at Rome, to which St. Paul refers here, was erected by the Emperor Tiberius,

acting under the advice of Sejanus. Before that time the guards were billeted in different parts of the city. It stood outside the walls, at some distance short of the 4th mile-stone, and so near either to the Salarian or the Nomentane road, that Nero, in his flight by one or the other of them to the house of his freedman Phaon, which was situated between the two, heard the cheers of the soldiers within for Galba. In the time of Vespasian the houses seem to have extended so far as to reach it (Tacitus, *Annal.* iv. 2; Suetonius, *Tib.* 37, *Neron.* 48; Plin. *H. N.* iii. 5). From the first, buildings must have sprung up near it for sutlers and others. It was embraced within the circuit of the walls of Aurelius and Honorius; on which its square outline may still be traced, like a projecting bastion. There is, however, another opinion maintained by Weiseler, that by the *Prætorium*, where St. Paul was imprisoned, we are to understand the quarters of that section of the Prætorians which formed the immediate body-guard of the emperor, and was posted in, or contiguous to, the palace of the Cæsars on the Palatine.

Rome, not to accuse his nation, but a prisoner, "bound with this chain," to answer for his faith in "the hope of Israel." Therefore had he invited them to this conference. The Jews replied, that they had received no letters from Judæa about him, nor had any of the brethren coming thence spoken any harm of him. As for this sect (or "heresy"), they knew that it was everywhere spoken against:—a phrase which seems to betray the germs of that ill-will which so soon broke out, but which may have been at first suppressed by their own curiosity as well as by St. Paul's courteous bearing.⁹⁰ They named a day to give him a full hearing, and came in large numbers to his lodging.

From the hour of admission in the morning, till the closing of the gates at evening, did Paul "expound and testify the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets." His method was the same that it had ever been, from the day when he opened his mouth in the synagogue of the Pisidian Antioch. And so was the result. Some indeed believed; but others believed not; and these were clearly the most. They went away disputing with one another; and the interview, which Paul had begun with that ardent desire for their salvation which had already breathed in his Epistle,⁹¹ was closed with the same prophetic denunciation with which he had sorrowfully followed up that utterance of his love,⁹²—the words of Isaiah, which Christ himself had applied to the unbelieving nation, whose every sense was willfully closed to the truth:—the five gates of Mansoul blockaded against Emmanuel, "And wisdom at *each* entrance quite shut out."⁹³ So he once more repeated the announcement that he had so often made before:—"Be it known therefore unto you that the salvation of God is sent unto the *Gentiles*, and that they will hear it." His last warnings were not altogether in vain; for after the Jews had left him, "they had *much reasoning among them-*

⁹⁰ Acts xxviii. 17-22. Besides these motives for that moderation of which a difficulty has been made, it seems very probable, from the Church of Rome consisting to a large degree of Gentiles, as well as from the constant persecutions to which the Roman Jews were exposed, and the secrecy which the Christians were obliged to observe, that the decisive opposition of the Jews against the Christians had not yet broken out at Rome.

⁹¹ Rom. x. 1: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved."

⁹² Rom. xi. 8: "According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear."

⁹³ Acts xxviii. 23-27; Is. vi. 9; Jer. v. 21; Ezek. xii. 2; Matt. xiii. 14, 15; Mark iv. 12; Luke viii. 10; John xii. 40.

selves”—not only disputation, but inquiry, concerning what they had heard.”

Here, so far as the Scripture narrative is concerned, the curtain falls upon the contest of Jewish unbelief against the things that concerned their salvation. And this we incline to regard as the very reason why the history of the *Acts* breaks off. As the narrative which illustrates the command of Jesus to his Apostles, to “preach the Gospel to the whole world, beginning at Jerusalem,” it opens with the opening of that commission at the religious centre of the world; it traces the successive offers to the Jews of Judea, Samaria and the Dispersion; to proselytes and Hellenists, in all the provinces that they frequented; and, it shows how their general disbelief caused the Gentiles to be received step by step into their place of privilege; till the Apostle, bringing back the offerings of those Gentile converts to bless his countrymen at Jerusalem, was finally rejected by them, and sent in chains to Rome. There, in the capital of the world, the unbelief of the last section of the Jewish family, to whom he revealed their Messiah, completed the first stage in the history of the diffusion of Christianity, at which the mass of the Jewish race are, for the time, cut off from the kingdom of God.

They are not, however, finally left in this fallen state. If the last recorded words of the Apostle’s living voice proclaimed at Rome their present sentence, the enduring records of his pen, gathering up the substance of the ancient promises, had already embodied, in writing to the Church of Rome, that prophetic announcement of their restoration, the mystery of which remains to be fulfilled, and those three wonderful chapters of the *Epistle to the Romans*” may be regarded as a supplement to the *Acts*. The spread of the Gospel over the purely heathen portion of the world belongs to the new chain of history which comes down to our own time, and the end of which will be found linked with the fulfillment of the promises concerning the Jews. Of this all that St. Luke deems it necessary to record is the happy commencement of Paul’s labors in the capital, where “he dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him; preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence (or boldness of speech),” no man forbidding him.”

These are the last words of the *Acts*. This history of the

²³ συζητησιν, Acts xxviii. 28, 29.

²⁴ Rom. ix., x., xi.

²⁵ παρρησίας, Acts xxviii. 30, 31

planting of the kingdom of Christ in the world brings us down to the time when the Gospel was openly proclaimed by the Apostle in the Gentile capital, and stops short of the mighty convulsion which was shortly to pronounce that kingdom established as the divine commonwealth for all men. The work of St. Paul belongs to the preparatory period. He was not to live through the time when the Son of Man came in the destruction of the Holy City and Temple, and in the throes of the New Age. The most significant part of his work was accomplished, when in the Imperial City he had declared his Gospel "to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile." But his career is not abruptly closed. Before he himself fades out of our sight in the twilight of ecclesiastical tradition, we have letters written by himself, which contribute some particulars to his external biography, and give us a far more precious insight into his convictions and sympathies.

§ 14. St. Paul's *Imprisonment at Rome* lasted two full years; nor is it difficult to account for the delay of his hearing before the emperor. It was necessary to the prosecution of such a case that the accusers should attend in person; and that they had not yet arrived is clear from the statement of the Roman Jews.⁹⁶ In the first year of Paul's imprisonment, an embassy was sent from Jerusalem to Rome, headed by Ishmael the high-priest and Helcias the treasurer of the Temple, concerning the triple dispute between the Jews, Agrippa, and the Procurator, about the Temple wall. If they were also charged with the case against St. Paul, they would have little encouragement or motive to its active prosecution. The success of their principal object, through the mediation of Poppea—who was a Jewish proselyte as well as Nero's mistress—doubtless exhausted all their influence with the emperor, who seems to have detained them at Rome in a spirit of suspicion. Nor could they hope, from that sense of justice which Nero brought to bear upon cases in which his passions were not excited, any reversal of the decision virtually pronounced by Felix. But the pretext of bringing up their witnesses from all the eastern provinces, and the forms of procedure in appeals to Cæsar, would give ample opportunities of delay; and they would be glad at least to keep Paul a prisoner.

Thus, through adversity and injustice, Paul obtained the fulfillment of his earnest desire "to preach the Gospel to them that are at Rome also." He tells us of the spiritual children whom he had begotten in his chains;⁹⁷ of his converts among

⁹⁶ Acts xxviii. 21.⁹⁷ Philem. 10.

Cæsar's household ;⁹⁸ and in one passage he gives a vivid description of the interest excited on behalf of the Gospel by his state and labors. He comforts his faithful and loving converts at Philippi, who now, as in the beginning of their Christian profession, were zealous in ministering to his wants, with the news that the troubles in which they sympathized with him "had fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the Gospel." So manifest had it become, in the Prætorium and elsewhere, that the cause of his imprisonment was *for Christ*, that even his bonds made other Christian brethren venture to speak the word more freely and fearlessly. The very Judaizers took courage to preach their version of the Gospel, in their usual spirit of personal hostility to the Apostle, hoping to add to the affliction of those bonds which prevented his coming forward to refute them. But Paul knew that his controversy with them was ended, and he magnanimously rejoices that even they helped to make known the name of Christ.⁹⁹

Meanwhile, amid the restraint, humiliation, and even pain of being constantly chained to a soldier, he was comforted by the society of some of his most attached disciples. LUKE shared the greater part, at least, of his imprisonment;¹⁰⁰ and TIMOTHY, of whose presence on the voyage to Rome we have no indication, seems to have joined him there at a later period.¹⁰¹ That ever honorable title of his "fellow-prisoners" is applied to ARISTARCHUS of Thessalonica, who had been Paul's companion from Philippi, and to EPAPHRAS, a Colossian.¹⁰² In the same salutation with these, and in close connection with Luke, appear two names peculiarly interesting. MARK is mentioned as "cousin to Barnabas," as if expressly to remove all doubt as to his identity, and at the same time to assure us that the breach caused by his departure from Perga had been entirely healed; and he is joined with Luke and DEMAS, as the *fellow-laborers* of the Apostle, in an asso-

⁹⁸ Phil. iv. 22. The word *oikías* here has doubtless the sense of the Latin *familia*, referring (chiefly at least) to the imperial freedmen and slaves.

⁹⁹ Phil. i. 12-18.

¹⁰⁰ Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24. Luke seems not to have been at Rome when the Epistle to the Philippians was written.

¹⁰¹ Col. i. 1; Philemon, 1; Phil. i. 1; ii. 19: compare Heb. xiii. 23. There is no clear proof that Timothy came to Rome as a prisoner; for the phrase in Heb. xiii. 23, "Know ye

that our brother Timothy is *set at liberty*," may quite as well be translated *is departed*. (See below, § 20). The hypothesis, maintained by some who reject the Pauline authorship of the *Hebrews*, that Timothy's liberation took place after Paul's martyrdom, and in consequence of the death of Nero, seems to us quite untenable. (See Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii. p. 596.)

¹⁰² Col. i. 7, iv. 10; Philem. 23. Concerning Epaphras and the Philippian Epaphroditus, see note 111.

ciation peculiarly touching from the contrast in which the three names afterward stand: Luke, steadfast from first to last; Mark, who had failed in the first trial, ardently desired as "profitable for the ministry;" Demas dismissed with the sorrowful sentence which has passed into a by-word.^{102b} With these may be mentioned TYCHICUS of Asia, who had been, with Aristarchus, the Apostle's companion from Corinth, and who now carried back to his native province those Epistles which form the great enduring work of Paul's imprisonment.¹⁰³

§ 15. For, so long as he lived, whether free to travel or shut up in prison, Paul would not resign the daily "care of all the churches." One means he had of promoting their welfare daily and hourly—the constant and earnest *prayer*, which his Epistles prove to have been a chief occupation of his solitude. But he was not shut out from intercourse with the Churches themselves. Now that he was tied down to one spot, but free to speak and write to whom he pleased, he would be the more earnest in making use of that mode of impression in which he had always excelled,¹⁰⁴ chastened by the solemn sadness natural to a prisoner advanced in age. The four Epistles, which are perhaps but some among many that he wrote from Rome, are linked together by a striking resemblance of tone, thought, and argument, as well as by internal marks which place the time of their composition beyond reasonable doubt. They were all written toward the latter part of his imprisonment at Rome, for all refer to the expectation of his release;¹⁰⁵ and those to the *Colossians*, to *Philemon*, and to the *Ephesians*, were somewhat earlier than that to the *Philippians*. The three former were sent to Asia by the same messengers, their salutations exhibit nearly the same names, and, besides their general likeness, those to the two churches contain identical passages, such as naturally occur in letters written by the same person at the same time. They were written after Paul had been long enough at Rome for the Philippians to have heard of his imprisonment, and to have sent relief to him by the hands of Epaphroditus, who

^{102b} Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 10, 11.

¹⁰³ Acts xx. 4; Col. iv. 7; Eph. vi. 21; comp. Titus iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 12.

¹⁰⁴ "His letters," say they, "are weighty and powerful."

¹⁰⁵ Eph. iii. 1, vi. 20; Col. iv. 18;

Philem. 22; Philipp. i. 7, iv. 22.

The fancy that they were written during Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea scarcely deserves a serious refutation. The two arguments are decisive, that Paul was not laboring in the Gospel at Cæsarea (Col. iv. 8, 4), nor could he expect to be

was now with him.¹⁰⁶ The interval before the return of Epaphroditus, bearing the letter to the Philippians, has to be extended so as to not only embrace his dangerous illness, but to allow for the news of it having been carried to the Philippians, and for the report of their sorrow at the tidings having been brought back to Rome.¹⁰⁷ As also the expectations of a speedy issue of his cause are expressed more distinctly in this Epistle, and Paul forms his plans for coming to Philippi, its date may be safely placed just before the expiration of his two years' imprisonment, *in the spring of A.D. 63*; and then, allowing for the necessary interval, the three others may be referred to the *autumn of 62*. Some, however, assign an earlier date to the three, from a supposed contrast between the mildness of the earlier part of Paul's imprisonment and the severer suffering which seems to be reflected in the Epistle to the Philippians: a change which might be due to the death of Burrus (in Jan., A.D. 62) and the declining influence of Seneca.¹⁰⁸

§ 16. COLOSSÆ¹⁰⁹ is a place that has not yet appeared in the records of St. Paul's labors. It was an ancient but somewhat decayed city of Phrygia, on the high-road between Ephesus and the Euphrates. It stood on the river Lycus, in the upper basin of the Mæander, and in the immediate neighborhood of Laodicea and Hierapolis, cities by whose growth it had been eclipsed.¹¹⁰ The foundation of a church here may have been one of the indirect results of Paul's ministry in Asia, and now he had heard with deep gratitude of the fruits of faith and love wrought among the Colossians by the word of Gospel truth, which had come to them, as it was taught by EPAPHRAS, a native of the city,¹¹¹ who, having been to

soon coming to Phrygia (Philem. 22).

¹⁰⁶ Col. vi. 12: comp. Phil. i. 7, iv. 18.

¹⁰⁷ Phil. ii. 25-30.

¹⁰⁸ Comp. Col. iv. 3, 4, with Phil. i. 20, 21, 30, ii. 27.

¹⁰⁹ Κολοσσαί, on coins and inscriptions, and in classical writers, but the later Greek writers have Κολασσαί (the reading of the best MSS. in Col. i. 2), which perhaps represents the local pronunciation. The later name of Colossæ was Chonæ, and its site has been discovered near the village of Chonas. It has been urged that St. Paul would probably have visited Colossæ on his Third Missionary

Journey, when he passed through all Phrygia (Acts xviii. 23, xix. 1), or when, during his prolonged stay at Ephesus, he spread the Gospel over all Asia, to which province Colossæ belonged politically. But his own words seem distinctly to imply that he had never been there, or at Laodicea, or in the district. (Col. ii. 1.)

¹¹⁰ St. Paul mentions the Christians of these cities, and especially the church at Laodicea, in connection with Colossæ (Col. ii. 1, iv. 13, 15, 16). St. John enumerates Laodicea, but not Colossæ, among the seven churches of Asia.

¹¹¹ ὁ ἐξ ἡμῶν, Col. iv. 12. For a fuller discussion of the question,

them a faithful minister of Christ, had now brought to Paul, in his imprisonment, the glad tidings of their love in the Spirit.¹¹²

In writing to congratulate them on their state, and to utter his prayers for their growth in the knowledge of God, the Apostle takes occasion, with his never-failing faithfulness, to warn them against evils about which perhaps it was a part of the mission of Epaphras to consult him. The Judaizers had come hither also, trying to enslave the converts to "food and drink, and the observance of feast, new moon, and sabbaths;" and the Apostle warns them not to suffer themselves to be judged by "things which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ."¹¹³ The false teacher,—for there seems an allusion to some individual¹¹⁴—not improbably an Alexandrian Jew—seems to have "led them captive"¹¹⁵ by a species of Gnostic philosophy, which the Apostle describes as "vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." As the essence of this philosophy consisted in the denial of Christ's Headship over the universe, and the ascription of creative and distinctive powers to various orders of beings, it was naturally connected with the Eastern theosophy which seems to have become almost indigenous at Colossæ, and which has strangely re-appeared in a Christianity corrupted by heathen elements. The Oriental worship of beings intermediate between God and man was easily transferred to angels; and this practice, having been condemned by a council held at Laodicea in the fourth century, is mentioned both by Theodoret and by the Byzantine writer Nicetas Choniates, who

whether Epaphras founded the Church, see Alford's Prolegomena to the Epistle, Greek Test., vol. iii. pp. 35, foll. According to the prevalent system of abbreviation (like Silas for Silvanus, Lucas for Lucanus, Apollos for Apollonius or Apollodorus, etc.) the name Epaphras is probably the same as Epaphroditus; and the probability that he came to Rome by way of Macedonia admits of his being identified with the Epaphroditus of Philippians ii. 25, iv. 28, though it seems more natural to suppose the latter to have been a Philippian.

¹¹² Col. i. 3-8.

¹¹³ Col. ii. 16, 17. "The same

three Mosaic observances are joined together in 1 Chron. xxiii. 31. Compare also Gal. iv. 10." (Conybeare and Howson, *in loc.*)

¹¹⁴ Βλέπετε, μή τις κ. τ. λ. (ver. 8): Μη οὖν τις ὑμᾶς κρινέτω (16); Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβεύετω (18).

¹¹⁵ συλαγωγῶν, ver. 8. It has been disputed whether these three corruptions, Judaism, Gnostic philosophy, and Oriental theosophy (uniting angel-worship with asceticism) were separately introduced, or were errors combined in the same false teaching. The latter view is favored by the whole tone of the Apostle's argument, and by the combination of these elements in the Jewish Cabala.

was a native of the place."¹¹⁶ This angel-worship was connected with a willful depreciation of the body which God has given to be the organ of the soul, and in which Christ himself came; as if its humiliation by ascetic practices would raise man nearer to that spiritual world of which the false teacher pretended to know so much. For his claim to this knowledge he is condemned by the Apostle "as intruding into those things which he hath not seen, being puffed up at random by his fleshly mind, and not holding the HEAD, from which the whole body, being by joints and bands fully supplied and knit together, increases in divine growth." That Head he explains to be CHRIST, with whom having died to the elements of the world, and rising again to seek the real "things above," where Christ sits on the right hand of God, the believer finds in a new spiritual life, "hid with Christ in God," the true mortification of all that is evil in his carnal nature; and, just because he is already dead to the world, refuses to be subject to ordinances after the commandments and teachings of men: "Which things," says the Apostle,—exposing in one sentence the mingled pride and folly of asceticism,—“though they have a show of wisdom, in self-chosen worship, and in humiliation, and in chastening [literally, not sparing] of the body, are of no value to check the indulgence of fleshly passions.”¹¹⁷ In one word, Paul meets all these errors by a fuller exposition than we have yet met with in his Epistles of the eternal glory and dignity of Christ as the head of all creation.¹¹⁸

§ 17. Such is the scope of the Epistle, which was doubtless called forth by the tidings brought by Epaphras, and was

¹¹⁶ Mr. Hartley (*Researches in Greece*, p. 52) relates the following legend, told by the modern Greeks about Colossæ:—“An overwhelming inundation threatened to destroy the Christian population of the city. They were fleeing before it in the utmost consternation, and imploring superior succor for their deliverance. At this critical moment, the archangel Michael descended from heaven, opened the chasm of the earth to which they still point, and at this opening the waters of the inundation were swallowed up, and the multitude was saved.” A church, built at the entrance of this chasm in honor of the archangel (*ναός ἀρχαγγελικός*), is mentioned by Nicetas.

The best comment, at once on this tradition and on the Apostle's warning, is the mention by Herodotus of this very chasm, into which the Lycus poured its stream (Herod. vii. 30.)

¹¹⁷ Col. ii. 16-23. We adopt Conybeare and Howson's rendering of the last phrase, which is confessedly difficult. The *ταπεινοφροσύνη* (*voluntary humility*) of ver. 18 is proved to refer to ascetic contempt for the body by its repetition in connection with *ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος* in ver. 23.

¹¹⁸ Col. i., ii. The resemblance of the argument of these chapters to that of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* is the great internal proof of St. Paul's authorship of the latter.

sent to the Colossians by the hands of Tychicus.¹¹⁹ But another person had come to Rome from Colossæ about the same time, and now returned as a sharer in the mission of Tychicus. This was ONESIMUS, who is described in the Epistle as "a faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you," that is, evidently, a Colossian.¹²⁰ Such was the kindly and honorable introduction with which the Apostle sent back to Colossæ the man who had left the city and fled to Rome as the runaway slave of PHILEMON, a wealthy and distinguished member of the Colossian Church;¹²¹ and with him he sent that brief but pregnant *Letter to Philemon*, which contains the germs of the eternal principles of Gospel morality in relation to slavery. It is evident, from the letter to him, that Philemon was a man of property and influence, since he is represented as the head of a numerous household, and as exercising an expensive liberality toward his friends and the poor in general. He was indebted to Paul as the medium of his personal participation in the Gospel, as the Apostle reminds him in that most expressive phrase, "not to say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides."¹²² His character, as shadowed forth in the Epistle to him, is one of the noblest which the sacred record makes known to us. He was full of faith and good works, was docile, confiding, grateful, was forgiving, sympathizing, charitable, and a man who on a question of simple justice needed only a hint of his duty to prompt him to go even beyond it.¹²³ Any one who studies the Epistle will perceive that it ascribes to him these varied qualities;—it bestows on him a measure of commendation which forms a striking contrast with the

¹¹⁹ Col. iv. 7, 8.

¹²⁰ Col. iv. 9. The comparison of this passage with the contents of the *Epistle to Philemon*, puts it beyond all doubt that the two were written and dispatched at the same time. See especially Philem. 12, *ὅν ἀνέπεμψα*.

¹²¹ That Philemon was a native of, or at least a resident at Colossæ, is confirmed from the letter being addressed to him jointly with Archippus (Philem. 2), who was a Colossian (Col. iv. 17). His conversion by St. Paul may have taken place during the Apostle's stay at Ephesus. His house at Colossæ was pointed out in the time of Theodoret; and another tradition made him bishop of the

church, and a martyr under Nero. The Epistle itself shows either that the Colossian church met for worship in his house, or that his numerous family formed in itself one of those Christian societies, to which the Apostle gives the name of "a church in a house." Philem. 2: comp. Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19: in the two latter cases, the "church in the house" was manifestly distinct from the principal church, since greetings were sent to it through the latter; and we may infer that a similar greeting would have appeared in the *Epistle to the Colossians*, had not Paul been writing to Philemon separately.

¹²² Philem. 19.

¹²³ Ver. 21. *ὑπὲρ ὃ λέγω ποιήσεις*.

ordinary reserve of the sacred writers. It was through such believers that the primitive Christianity evinced its divine origin, and spread so rapidly among the nations.

The tone in which Paul asks forgiveness for Onesimus is worthy alike of such a man and of himself. He might have used his authority in Christ to enjoin what was right; but he preferred to exhort Philemon from motives of love, "being such an one as Paul the elder, and now also a prisoner of Jesus Christ."¹²⁴ *He* also had a claim upon Onesimus, his "son, begotten in his bonds," and now doubly "profitable" (as he does not disdain to say playfully) "to thee and to me."¹²⁵ He would have kept him with himself, to minister in the Gospel, but he would not even seem to force Philemon to confer the favor except of his free-will; and so he sends Onesimus back, having no doubt persuaded him to return as an act of Christian duty. But, while thus respecting the legal right of the master over the slave, he clearly intimates that the law of Christ would not be fulfilled by the simple return of Onesimus to slavery:—"Perhaps for this cause he departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him forever; *not now as a slave, but above a slave, a brother beloved*, first of all to me, and how much more to thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord. If thou count me therefore in fellowship with thee, *receive him as myself*."¹²⁶ Thus completely identifying himself with Onesimus, the Apostle engages to make good any loss that he had caused to his master; and, as if to make the promise legally binding, he writes this passage at least of the Epistle with his own hand; not, however, without gently reminding Philemon that he would still owe him his own soul over and above.¹²⁷ Such is the Apostle's practical comment on his own text, "In Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all;" teaching which is the more interesting when viewed in its connection

¹²⁴ Philem. 8, 9.

¹²⁵ Philem. 10, 11. *Ὁνησιμος* means *profitable*. The allusion, in its relation to Paul, perhaps implies that Onesimus had made himself useful in many services which his former condition would enable him especially to render. We know nothing of how he had come to that knowledge of the Apostle which led to his conversion; but, as he belonged to a Christian household, it is not improbable that he knew something of the Christian doctrine before he

went to Rome. There are traditions that he became bishop of Beroëa in Macedonia, and that he returned to Rome, and suffered martyrdom under Nero.

¹²⁶ Philem. 12-17. The *ἐν σαρκί* seems to refer to the personal relations which united a kind master to a household slave.

¹²⁷ *πρὸς ὀφείλεις*, ver. 19. It is doubtful how far the words *εἰ δέ τι ἡδίκησέ σε ἢ ὀφείλει* bear out the common interpretation, that Onesimus had robbed his master.

with the passages in the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians concerning the duties of masters and servants.

§ 18. Onesimus accompanied Tychicus, the bearer of the Apostle's letter to the Colossians, as well as of a very similar Epistle to the Church of Ephesus, through which city he would pass on his route. His mission to both churches is described in almost the same terms: to let them know the Apostle's condition while inquiring into their own, and to comfort their hearts.¹²⁸ The *Epistle to the Ephesians*, however, does not seem to have been called forth by any special circumstances, nor even to have involved any distinctly precautionary teaching, whether against Oriental or Judaistic theosophy, but to have been suggested by the deep love which the Apostle felt for his converts at Ephesus, and which the mission of Tychicus, with an Epistle to the Church of Colossæ, afforded him a convenient opportunity of evincing in written teaching and exhortation. The Epistle thus contains many thoughts that have pervaded the nearly contemporaneous Epistle to the Colossians, reiterates many of the same practical warnings and exhortations, and bears even the tinge of the same diction. The highest characteristic which these two Epistles have in common is that of a presentation of the LORD JESUS CHRIST, fuller and clearer than we find in previous writings, as the HEAD of creation and of mankind. All things created through Christ, all things coherent in him, all things reconciled to the Father by him, the eternal purpose to restore and complete all things in him—such are the ideas which grew richer and more distinct in the mind of the Apostle, as he meditated on the Gospel which he had been preaching, and the truths implied in it.¹²⁹ In the *Epistle to the Colossians*, this Divine Headship of Christ is maintained as the safeguard against the fancies which filled the heavens with secondary divinities, and which laid down rules for an artificial sanctity of men upon the earth. In the *Epistle to the Ephesians*, the eternity and universality of God's redeeming purpose in Christ, and the gathering of men unto him as his

¹²⁸ Col. iv. 7-9; Eph. vi. 21, 22: the slight verbal differences, however, are very interesting. The chief object of the mission to the Colossians, who had excited the Apostle's anxiety, was to inquire into their state; to his old and attached converts at Ephesus it was to inform them of his. The common clause, *ὃν ἐπεμψα πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰς τὸ*

αὐτὸ τοῦτο, is followed in the one case by *ἵνα γνῶ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν*, in the other by *ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν*. These are the true readings, though of course they are confounded in the MSS.

¹²⁹ It is inferred that *Colossians* was written before *Ephesians*, from the greater expansion of these topics in the latter Epistle.

members, are set forth as gloriously revealed in the Gospel. In both, the application of the truth concerning Christ, as the Image of God and the Head of Men, to the common relations of human life—and particularly of husband and wife, parents and children, masters and servants—is dwelt upon in such detail as to form a perfect code of Christian social morals.

Besides all this, the *Epistle to the Ephesians* enlarges upon such profound mysteries of the Divine counsels, displays so fully the *origin and developments of the Church in Christ*, its union, communion, and aggregation in him, that this majestic Epistle can never be rightly deemed otherwise than one of the most sublime and consolatory outpourings of the Spirit of God to the children of men. To the Christians at Ephesus, dwelling under the shadow of the great Temple of Diana, daily seeing its outward grandeur, and almost daily hearing of its pompous ritualism, the allusions in this Epistle to that mystic building, of which Christ was the corner-stone, the Apostles the foundations, and himself and his fellow-Christians portions of the august superstructure, must have spoken with a force, an appropriateness, and re-assuring depth of teaching, that can not be overestimated.¹²⁰

The question, not long since keenly debated, whether the Ephesian Church was really that to which this Epistle was addressed, or whether it is the *Laodicean Epistle* mentioned in *Colossians* iv. 16, seems to us to have been so completely decided in favor of the received opinion, as only to need a supplementary notice.¹²¹

§ 19. These three Epistles were followed—but, as we have seen, at some considerable interval — by the *Epistle to the Philippians*, whose date nearly all critics concur in fixing toward the end of Paul's imprisonment, in the latter part of A.D. 62, or the beginning of A.D. 63. The Epistle to the Philippians resembles the Second to the Corinthians in the effusion of personal feeling, but differs from it in the absence of all soreness. It contains less of censure, and more of praise than any other of Paul's extant letters. The Christians at Philippi had regarded the Apostle with love and reverence from the beginning, and had given him many proofs of their affection. They had now sent him a contribution toward his maintenance

¹²⁰ Eph. ii. 19-22. Dr. Howson has pointed out the increased force which the celebrated description of the Christian soldier, warring "not against flesh and blood," derives from Paul's position as a prisoner in the

Prætorium (Eph. vi. 10-20). An old divine, Gurnall, has made this passage the text of an elaborate but racy commentary (*The Christian in Complete Armor*, in 4 vols. 8vo).

¹²¹ See *Notes and Illustrations* (B).

at Rome, such as we must suppose him to have received from time to time for the expenses of "his own hired house." The bearer of this contribution was Epaphroditus, an ardent friend and fellow-laborer of St. Paul, who had fallen sick on the journey or at Rome.¹³³ The Epistle was written to be conveyed by Epaphroditus on his return, and to express the joy with which St. Paul had received the kindness of the Philippians. He dwells therefore upon their fellowship in the work of spreading the Gospel, a work in which he was even now laboring, and scarcely with the less effect on account of his bonds. His imprisonment had made him known, and had given him fruitful opportunities of declaring his Gospel among the Imperial guard,¹³⁴ and even in the household of the Cæsar.¹³⁵ He professes his undiminished sense of the glory of following Christ, and his expectation of an approaching time in which the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven as a deliverer. There is a *gracious* tone running through this Epistle, expressive of humility, devotion, kindness, delight in all things fair and good, to which the favorable circumstances under which it was written gave a natural occasion, and which helps us to understand the kind of ripening which had taken place in the spirit of the writer.

The allusions in this Epistle to the relief of Paul's necessities raise the question of how he was maintained during his imprisonment, and whether he was still able to labor with his own hands. Thus much we know, that, while sometimes pinched with want, he so husbanded what resources he had, as to be able (for he was not the man to make a vain promise) to repay Philemon whatever he might have lost by Onesimus.

When this Epistle was written, Paul was expecting the crisis of his earthly fate, as nearer in prospect, but even less hopeful in its issue, than when he wrote the other three. Then, he was so confidently anticipating a favorable answer to the prayers for his release, that he asks Philemon to prepare him a lodging. Now, while still trusting in the efficacy of those prayers, he is above all anxious that they should be directed to his support in the coming trial, "That in nothing shall I be ashamed, but that with boldness, as always, so now also, *Christ shall be magnified* in my body, whether *by life or by death.*"¹³⁶ There is a striking resemblance, but also a striking contrast, between these utterances and his last in the Second Epistle to Timothy. The noble note of perfected

¹³³ Phil. ii. 27.¹³⁴ Phil. i. 13.¹³⁵ Phil. iv. 22.¹³⁶ Phil. i. 20.

resignation—"I am now ready to be offered"—is precluded by the comparison—"To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." But still it is a comparison, an alternative, in which the decision (if it were his to make) seems to him most difficult; and his own earnest "desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better," is overborne by the need that the Church still had of his service; and so he comes to the confident conclusion, "I know that I shall abide and continue with you all, for your furtherance and joy of faith."¹³⁶ Still, however, the conflict may be traced throughout the Epistle; and the passage in which he comes nearest to planning his future movements, if released, stands in close connection with the opposite alternative:—"Yea, and if I be offered on the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all. . . . But I trust in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus shortly unto you Him therefore I hope to send presently, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord that I also myself shall come shortly."¹³⁷

It is not difficult to find reasons for all this in the altered state of affairs at Rome. The second year of Paul's imprisonment marks the most unfavorable crisis in the court and character of Nero. The death of Burrus (Jan., A.D. 62) deprived the emperor of his most manly councilor, and the Apostle of that "captain of the guard" to whom he had been recommended by Julius, and by whom he had been leniently treated. The office was divided, and Fenius Rufus proved too weak to check his colleague Tigellinus, the worst of Nero's satellites.¹³⁸ The influence of Seneca was declining, though we may doubt whether the philosopher would have had much sympathy with the Apostle.¹³⁹ Worst of all, Nero cemented by a marriage his connection with Poppæa, for whose sake he divorced and murdered his young wife Octavia; and the birth of a son, at the beginning of A.D. 63, gave her a paramount influence, which, as a Jewish proselyte, she would naturally use against the Apostle. Paul's very success in gaining converts in the imperial household would increase his danger; and he now complains of that disheartening abandonment by friends which is the very gall of adversity.¹⁴⁰

But, while borne up inwardly by faith, prayer, and resigna-

¹³⁶ Phil. i. 21-26.

¹³⁷ Phil. ii. 17-24.

¹³⁸ Some commentators trace in the *Epistle to the Philippians* indications of increased rigor in St. Paul's treatment.

¹³⁹ No student of this period of history should overlook Mr. Merivale's comparison between Paul and Seneca. *Hist. of the Romans under the Empire*, vol. vi. p. 292.

¹⁴⁰ Phil. ii. 20, 21.

tion, he found a safeguard in the emperor himself. Among the sentiments and tastes, the unbridled indulgence of which proved the ruin of Nero's character, the sentiment of justice to his subjects survived. Paul probably knew this when he appealed to Cæsar; nor was the appeal made in vain. In those cases which Nero reserved for his own hearing, he was conspicuous for the precision which he demanded of the pleaders, and for the care with which he delivered his judgments in writing, after taking the opinion of competent advisers. There is the best reason to believe the prevailing tradition that, after an imprisonment of two years, Paul's case was heard by the emperor and decided in his favor. We have no positive contemporary record of the fact; but there is one piece of direct historic evidence, from which it seems fairly to be inferred. The precision with which St. Luke specifies the duration of Paul's imprisonment justifies the inference that it came to an end at the close of the "two years," that is, in the spring of A.D. 63.

Some modern writers have, indeed, maintained the paradoxical theory that Paul's imprisonment ended only with his martyrdom, which they place much earlier than the received date.¹⁴¹ Their reasons are purely negative. They set aside the statements of ecclesiastical tradition as worthless. The testimony of the Pastoral Epistles to St. Paul's freedom, his use of it in fresh apostolic circuits in Asia and Europe, and his renewed imprisonment at Rome, with the prospect of death before him, is got rid of generally by a denial of the genuineness of these Epistles, or by referring them to a much earlier period of the Apostle's life; but the latter view seems clearly untenable, so that the objection is resolved into the former. The whole argument will be examined presently.

There remain the indications in the four Epistles written during his imprisonment at Rome, of Paul's assurance of his coming release and his plans in reference to it, besides the celebrated project, in the Epistle to the Romans, of a visit to Spain. But it is contended that St. Paul's expectations were not always realized, and that the passages from Philemon and Philippians are effectually neutralized by Acts xx. 25—"I know that ye all (at Ephesus) shall see my face no more;"—inasmuch as the supporters of the ordinary view hold that St. Paul went again to Ephesus. This is a fair answer to the argument from *intention alone*, leaving out of view the testi-

¹⁴¹ This received date, though the leading authorities differ to some extent, lies within the interval from midsummer A.D. 66 to midsummer A.D. 68. The authorities will be given in their proper place. (See chap. xix § 13).

mony of tradition and the authority of the Pastoral Epistles. But this is not all. The testimony of Luke places the objectors in this dilemma: if Paul had been martyred at the end of two years, Luke would certainly not have broken off without recording so important a fact: if his imprisonment had been prolonged beyond the two years, Luke could not have named this as its precise duration; and so the conclusion seems irresistible, that he was then set free.¹⁴²

§ 20. Before we consider the light thrown upon the remainder of the Apostle's life by the Pastoral Epistles and by the ancient Christian writers, it is necessary to notice the relation of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* to his first imprisonment at Rome. This is not the place to discuss the authorship of that marvelous composition.¹⁴³ It will be enough here to say that the striking resemblances between this Epistle and those to the Colossians and Ephesians, on the doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the creation—not only as to the general principle, but in the details of its expression—have long since wrought in our mind the growing conviction that the great mass of the ancient Church was right in regarding the Epistle as Paul's, and not only that these works were the product of the same mind, but at the same stage of its development, and under the same circumstances. And what is more probable and consistent than that, in the leisure and retirement of his prison, amid the vain pomps and assumptions of Cæsarism, and when his last attempt to convince the Jews had been frustrated,—that the Jew, who had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, who had made advances in his national faith above his equals, and who could now review his rabbinical lore in the light of Gospel truth,—that such a man, under such conditions, should work out, for the benefit of Jewish Christians, especially in Palestine, the great doctrine of Christ's pre-eminence above all creatures, in earth or heaven, as established by the covenant of God with his ancient people, and illustrated by all the symbols of their worship?

The other element, which runs through the whole Epistle, tends to the same conclusion. The writer, whoever he may be, is addressing a persecuted body of Christians, whose faith was sorely tried; and each point of his great argument is in-

¹⁴² To those who admit the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, we can not see how this argument can be otherwise than unanswerable; for, when Paul was in prison, expecting his martyrdom, *Luke was with him* (2 Tim. iii. 11).

¹⁴³ See the Appendix, *On the Books of the New Testament*.

tertwined with the most earnest exhortations to constancy, the most glowing examples of faith triumphing over suffering and death, the most solemn warning against apostasy, ever embodied in human language. And if we know of no writer of the apostolic age, but Paul, capable both intellectually and spiritually of writing the Epistle,¹⁴⁴ so we know of no Church except that of Judæa at this very crisis, to which both the doctrinal and practical parts of the Epistle would be pre-eminently adapted. Troubled within by the Judaistic conflict, they wanted a full and final demonstration of the true relation of Judaism to Christianity. Drawn on, with the rest of their countrymen, nearer and nearer to the verge of that frightful national convulsion in which all that was external in Judaism was to perish, they needed to be consoled and fortified by the lesson that all that was vital had been first absorbed into Christianity, so that the rest "having decayed and grown old, was ready to vanish away."¹⁴⁵ Exposed doubly, as Christians to the malice of the Jews, and as Jews to the hatred of the Greeks, under a government which, since the death of Festus, was hurrying on to anarchy, they required to be fortified against persecution and apostasy.

Nay more, there seem to be distinct allusions to the recent martyrdom of their own rulers, of which they themselves had been spectators, which enable us to specify, with great probability, the very persecution under which they suffered. Besides reminding them of "the great conflict of sufferings" which they had endured in "the former days, in which they were enlightened,"—the persecutions in the first age of Chris-

¹⁴⁴ We may safely affirm, with their extant Epistles for our guide, that the style is not that of Peter, John, or James; while the whole tone is that of apostolic authority. To the theory of Luther, who ascribes the Epistle to Apollos, because he was a learned Jew, eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures—and much more to any unknown person of that age—we may reply, as Herodotus does to those who sought an imaginary origin for the inundation of the Nile, that "it does not admit of discussion," because it has not even any *prima facie* evidence in its favor.

¹⁴⁵ It seems to be implied in the whole argument—and especially in the passages viii. 4, foll., and ix. 6,

foll. (where the *present* tenses of the Greek are unaccountably changed into *past* in the English Version), and xiii. 10, foll.—that the Temple was standing, and that its usual course of divine service was carried on without interruption. The Epistle must therefore have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Such passages as vi. 8, viii. 13, x. 25, 37, xii. 27, indicate the approach of the doom foretold by Christ, and watched for by the Christians; but these forebodings seem less distinct than they might have been if uttered *immediately* before the catastrophe—that is, after the Jewish War had actually commenced. This argument would place the date of the Epistle before A.D. 66.

tianity,¹⁴⁶—and after recounting the “great cloud of martyrs” of ancient times—he comes to the recent examples of a faith parallel to theirs, and exhorts the brethren to “remember *their own leaders*, who had spoken to them the word of the Lord, and *reviewing* (as spectators) *the end of their course*, to imitate their faith.”¹⁴⁷ Now it was in the second year of Paul’s imprisonment at Rome (A.D. 62) that the High-priest Ananus availed himself of the vacancy in the procuratorship, between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus, to perpetrate the judicial murder of St. James the Just and other leaders of the Church of Jerusalem, according to the account of Josephus.^{147b} How precisely does the language of the Epistle apply to the martyrdom of the Apostle who is usually regarded as the first bishop of Jerusalem, and who certainly had a special oversight of that Church! This allusion, moreover, confirms the ancient opinion that “the Hebrews,” to whom the Epistle was addressed (according to the title, for it begins without a superscription), were the Jewish Christians of Palestine, and of Jerusalem in particular. Its direct personal appeals and salutations prove that it had some such original destination; while the superscription may have been omitted to denote its wider destination for Jewish Christians everywhere.

Besides these general indications, there are specific allusions, which not only confirm the authorship as St. Paul’s, but throw light upon the Apostle’s movements. Foremost of these is the request, so strikingly parallel to passages in the Epistle to the Philippians, for the prayers of the brethren, first that the writer might be able to keep *a good conscience*, and to maintain an *honorable course*¹⁴⁸—words precisely suited to

¹⁴⁶ Heb. x. 32, 33. The following passage in the English Version, “For ye had compassion of me in my bonds” (ver. 34), carries our minds irresistibly to “Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ,” and to the ministration of his friends at Cæsarea (Acts xxiv. 23), though the connection of the *for* is not clear. But the decisive preponderance of MS. authority compels us to give up the reading τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου for τοῖς δεσμίους, “ye had compassion *with the prisoners*,” for it was thus that they “became companions (or partners) with those who were so treated” (ver. 33). But if the Pauline authorship be established on other evidence, the

passage acquires a peculiar force as coming from him who was best qualified to bear such testimony, the very “Saul who made havoc of the church, entering into every house”—doubtless “spoiling their goods” (Heb. x. 34)—“and haling men and women, *committed them to prison*” (Acts viii. 3).

¹⁴⁷ Heb. xiii. 7: ὡν ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν ἐκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς.

^{147b} Comp. c. xx. § 7.

¹⁴⁸ Heb. xiii. 18. The passage irresistibly suggests Paul’s repeated professions of *a good conscience* (Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16; 2 Cor. i. 12); and for the latter clauses, compare Phil. i. 19, 20.

his trial before Nero—and next that, as the result of his being thus supported, he might be restored to them the sooner.¹⁴⁹ Next comes the passage—"Know ye that our brother Timothy is set at liberty (or rather, *has departed*),¹⁵⁰ with whom, if he come quickly, I will see you." Compare this with what Paul wrote to the Philippians—"I trust in the Lord Jesus to send Timotheus shortly unto you . . . so soon as I shall see how it will go with me. But I trust in the Lord that I also shall come shortly."¹⁵¹ Few can doubt that the two passages come from the same pen and refer to the same *series* of intended movements, though, as intentions only are spoken of in the briefest terms, the details are somewhat obscure. Thus much seems clear, that the passage in *Hebrews* was written when, even if the trial was not concluded,¹⁵² its issue was so well foreseen the writer could exchange "*I trust*" for "*I will see you*;" and when Timothy had departed, probably on his mission to the Philippians, to carry to them the good news, as Paul had promised, and to bring back word of their state.¹⁵³ Such a mission would supersede the *immediate* execution of Paul's design of visiting Philippi;¹⁵⁴ and he may have been urged to go straight to Jerusalem by the same motives that induced him to write the Epistle to the Hebrews. The news of the persecution of the Christians by Ananus would doubt-

¹⁴⁹ Heb. xiii. 19: comp. Philem. 22; Phil. i. 25, ii. 24.

¹⁵⁰ Heb. xiii. 23: ἀπολελυμένον. The best commentators are now generally agreed on this sense. Comp. Acts xv. 33, xxviii. 25; Ex. xxxiii. 11 in the LXX.; Polyb. ii. 34, § 12. There is no clear evidence that Timothy was at Rome as a prisoner. 1 Tim. vi. 12 may refer to his having been "a confessor;" but its more natural sense seems to be his profession of faith at his ordination. Comp. c. xx. § 20.

¹⁵¹ Phil. ii. 19-24. Incidentally we may remark on the utter improbability of the Epistle, containing these direct personal allusions to the writer, being handed down by the early Church without some explanation of who that writer was, had there been a question of his being any other than St. Paul. The "*I will see you*," "*our* brother Timothy," and so forth, are simply absurd as coming from any but a well-

known author, who was at once a prisoner at Rome and a near friend of Timothy; while the whole tone of the Epistle leaves little doubt that that well-known author was *also* an Apostle.

¹⁵² Critics of high authority regard the passage xiii. 18, 19, as not implying that Paul was still a prisoner, and ver. 23 as disproving such a view. Mr. Lewin says: "Paul, at the date of this Epistle, was certainly at liberty, and was expecting Timothy from the mission on which the latter had been sent to Philippi" (*Fast. Sac.* A.D. 63, No. 1941). The writer's intention of *accompanying* Timothy (Heb. xiii. 23) seems to show that the latter could not well be the bearer of the Epistle, as is stated in the epigraph: "Written to the Hebrews from Italy by Timothy."


¹⁵³ Phil. ii. 19.

¹⁵⁴ Phil. ii. 24, where the ταχέως is less definite than the τάχιον of Heb. xiii. 23.

less be brought to Rome by some of the fugitives ; and Paul, desiring to strengthen his brethren by his personal presence, may have resolved to sail for Judæa, as soon as the navigation opened, in company with Timothy, if the latter returned soon enough from Philippi. Meanwhile he probably sent the Epistle to Jerusalem, to prepare the brethren for his coming. As to the *place* from which he wrote it, the words "*They of Italy salute you*" are decisive, if we accept, as we probably should, the rendering of our version.¹⁰⁰

This reasoning would lead us, with more than probability, to the *first step* of the Apostle's course after his release from his imprisonment. For the question is not (as in cases before noticed) of a mere intention ; but of a positive intention to be executed so immediately that he would not wait long for Timothy's return :—"With whom, *if he come the quicker* (τάχιστον) *I will see you.*" This seems almost decisive for the direction of Paul's course straight to Jerusalem, on his liberation in the spring of A.D. 63.

¹⁰⁰ Heb. xiii. 24 : οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. Some draw the opposite inference from the word ἀπὸ, and contend for *Cæsarea*, as suiting the indications of Paul's imprisonment—a theory no more tenable than that which refers the *Colossians*, etc., to *Cæsarea* ; or for *Athens*, as the place where Timothy might have met Paul. But the truth seems to be that οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας is properly used by a person writing from *Italy*, with reference to the point of view of the readers—a point of view so often taken in epistolary language.



Ancient Ship.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) LAODICEA.

THE two passages in the N. T. where this city is mentioned define its geographical position in harmony with other authorities. In Rev. i. 11, iii. 14, it is spoken of as belonging to the general district which contained Ephesus, Smyrna, Thyatira, Pergamus, Sardis, and Philadelphia. In Col. iv. 13, 15, it appears in still closer association with Colossæ and Hierapolis. And this was exactly its position. It was a town of some consequence in the Roman province of Asia; and it was situated in the valley of the Mæander, on a small river called the Lycus, with Colossæ and Hierapolis a few miles distant to the west.

Built, or rather rebuilt, by one of the Seleucid monarchs, and named in honor of his wife, Laodicea became under the Roman government a place of some importance. Its trade was considerable: it lay on the line of a great road; and it was the seat of a *conventus*. From Rev. iii. 17, we should gather it was a place of great wealth. The damage which was caused by an earthquake in the reign of Tiberius (Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 27) was promptly repaired by the energy of the inhabitants. It was soon after this occurrence that Christianity was introduced into Laodicea. In subsequent times it became a Christian city of eminence, the see of a bishop, and a meeting-place of councils. It is often mentioned by the Byzantine

writers. The Mahometan invaders destroyed it; and it is now a scene of utter desolation: but the extensive ruins near *Denislu* justify all that we read of Laodicea in Greek and Roman writers. Many travelers have visited and described the place, but the most elaborate and interesting account is that of Hamilton.

(B.) THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS, AND THE LAODICEAN EPISTLE MENTIONED IN COL. IV. 16.

The theory that the *Epistle to the Ephesians* was written to the *Laodiceans*, and sent by Tychicus at the same time as the *Epistle to the Colossians*, the two churches being exhorted to a mutual reading of the two letters, involves two questions—(1.) Is this *Epistle* wrongly entitled to the *Ephesians*? (2.) Was it addressed to the *Laodiceans*? The importance of this distinction will appear presently from the fact that the arguments for each proposition are not quite mutually corroborative.

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—1. The Vatican MS. (Codex B), well known as being of the highest authority, omits the name of Ephesus in the superscription, the words which we enclose in brackets being only added in the margin by a much later hand—*Παῦλος, ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ, τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ*] καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰη-

σοῦ (Eph. i. 1)—where it is at once evident how difficult it is to make sense of the phrase, τοῖς οὖν καὶ πιστοῖς, which is also a construction without a parallel in St. Paul's writings. On the other hand, this formula, with the name of the place, is precisely parallel to the superscriptions of the Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians (second Epistle), and the Philippians. As a matter of textual evidence, the omission is outweighed by the presence of the words in all the other principal MSS., and in all the ancient versions. In reference to modern authority, Tischendorf has now removed the brackets within which he formerly placed the words. Nor must it be overlooked that most, if not all, the advocates for their rejection—constrained by their acceptance of Marcion's authority (see below), as well as by the desire both to make sense of the passage and to decide who really were the persons addressed—not only omit ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, but insert ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ, thus themselves rejecting that very authority of the Codex B, which is their main external argument.

Of course the omission, which in such a MS. could hardly be accidental, indicates a doubt as to the genuineness of the word at a very early period. The existence of such a doubt, which we are about to prove, accounts for the peculiar form of the omission. The doubt being whether the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ or ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ should be inserted, the transcriber appears to have compromised the matter by omitting both, at the expense of leaving the sense imperfect. Thus the absence of the words, which is the only fact attested by the MS., is accounted for, while the preponderating testimony of the MSS. and Versions proves the opinion of Christian antiquity that the doubt was not well founded.

2. St. Basil (in the latter half of the fourth century) had learned from those before him that the Ephesians (to whom, however, he believes the Epistle to have been addressed) were not named in the superscription, which ran τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖν καὶ πιστοῖς, and so he had himself seen it in ancient copies. This again attests the fact of the words having been at least questioned very early, which is also confirmed by Tertullian, Jerome, and Epiphanius, who are however referring to the very controversy raised by Marcion, in which the explanation of the doubt is to be found.

3. As early as the first half of the third century (about a century and a half before Basil), the heretic Marcion asserted that the words Πρὸς Λαοδικέας were in the title of the MSS. which he used; but Marcion is universally charged by the Christian Fathers with making arbitrary alterations in those books of the Scripture which he accepted. It is indeed argued that he tampered with the text on doctrinal grounds which could not induce him to alter the title of an epistle. But the testimony of a person who corrupts documents in some points becomes worthless in all; and Marcion is actually accused by his contemporary, Tertullian, of inserting the words Πρὸς Λαοδικέας in the title. Nor can we admit that the statement about Marcion's adding the words proves that there was no address in the copies known to Tertullian, or even, if so, that the conclusion would have much force. For it is admitted on all hands that the Epistle was addressed to some particular church or churches, and the whole question is about the substitution of one name for another.

Archbishop Ussher propounded the ingenious conjecture, that the Epistle was a circular letter, addressed to

several churches, in the same way as the Epistle to the Galatians was addressed to all the churches in Galatia, and those to Corinth to the Christians "in the whole province of Achaia" (2 Cor. i. 1); and that Tychicus carried several copies of it, differently superscribed, one for Laodicea, another for Hierapolis, another for Philadelphia, and so on. Hence many of the early copyists, perplexed by this diversity in their copies, might be led to omit the words in which the variation consisted; and thus the state of the earliest known text of the Epistle (that of the Codex Vaticanus) would be explained. When the Epistle was afterward spread over the world, Ephesus, the great commercial capital of Asia, being the place from which copies of it were mostly procured, it would obtain the title of the "Epistle from Ephesus," and lastly the name of Ephesus would be inserted in the text. This theory, however, besides wanting the substratum of any positive evidence, is open to the objection, that in the examples cited of a plurality of address, as well as in John's Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia (the very churches now in question), there is one common superscription indicating all those who were addressed; and so here we should expect some such phrase as τοῖς ὄντιν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ (with an extension, if necessary, to include the churches beyond the limits of the province).

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—1. *The absence of any salutation to individual members of a church so familiar to Paul as the Ephesians* is too negative to be of any weight, and if of any, it would only go to prove the very point which the objectors themselves give up, that it was a General Epistle. Its special character is conclusively proved by chap. vi. 21, 22, as well as by the mention of *the brethren* in ver. 23.

The suggestion that Paul had no personal friends to greet among the Laodiceans, "who had not seen his face in the flesh," is answered by the fact, that of the only two persons saluted by name in the Epistle to the Colossians, Nymphas is a Laodicean (Col. iv. 15: some suppose the same of Archippus, ver. 17). In the Epistle to the Philippians, also distinguished for their close relations to the Apostle, the personal salutations are equally "conspicuous by their absence;" for the two ladies, Euodia and Syntyche, are not named in the way of salutation, but of exhortation to make up some quarrel (Phil. iv. 20). Tychicus might well be charged with individual salutations to those friends whose very number made it difficult for the Apostle to indite his wonted autograph with that fettered hand to which he pathetically refers in the salutation of the sister epistle, as if apologizing for its brevity:—"The salutation by the hand of me Paul: *remember my bonds*" (Col. iv. 18).

2. The Christians to whom he writes are addressed as *exclusively Gentiles, recent converts*, of whose conversion Paul knew only by report, and who only knew him as an Apostle by hearsay, so that he might need *credentials* to accredit him with them (Eph. i. 13, 15, ii. 11, 13, iii. 2, 4, iv. 17, v. 8); all of which points are inappropriate to the Ephesians, and exactly suitable to the Laodiceans. We answer in one word, that these texts do not seem to sustain the inferences drawn from them.

(i.) The magnificent statement of the position of the Gentiles in the Church (not without important allusions to their communion with their Jewish brethren, ii. 12-22) is surely far too suitable to the Christians of such a city as Ephesus, to be affected by any question of how many Jews

were included in that Church. It is enough for us to know (what is clear from Acts xix. 8-10) that the majority of the Ephesian Christians were Gentiles; and it might just as well be argued, from Rom. xi. 13, that there were no Jews in the Church at Rome.

(ii.) It is in connection with this same argument, to impress upon them the duties resulting from their translation from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of light, that the Apostle dwells so emphatically—not upon the newness of their conversion, but upon the *magnitude of the change* (ch. i. 13, ii. 18, v. 8). What he had *heard* of their faith and love refers evidently, not to first intelligence, but to the cheering news brought to him in his confinement at Rome (i. 15); while the converse reference in iii. 1, foll., to what not the Ephesians only—but all the Gentiles, as whose representatives Paul deals with them—had heard of “the dispensation of the grace of God committed to him for them,” is called forth from “Paul the *prisoner* of Jesus Christ” by his inability to converse with them in person of this great revelation. The *εἶπε* (which Conybeare strains into *if, as I suppose, ye have heard*) is surely rhetorical, and not hypothetical, an appeal to their certain knowledge. The phrase, “as I wrote afore in few words,” might seem, at first sight, to support the opinion that Paul had for the first time opened the subject to them in some previous letter. He might indeed have availed himself of his enforced leisure to write more fully of the *nature* of that ministry to the Gentiles, which he had *practically* exercised when among them; but the truth seems to be that he is simply referring back to a passage in this very Epistle (i. 9, 10). This interpretation is adopted by Conybeare, and yet this is the sole passage to

which he can refer in proof of the Apostle’s being only known to them by *hearsay*, and needing *credentials* (v. 4) to accredit him with them! Surely enough has been said to show the haste of the same author’s judgment concerning the destination of the Epistle—“The least disputable fact is, that it was not addressed to the Church of Ephesus.”


3. There still remains the most important and difficult point, the allusion in the salutation of the Epistle to the Colossians: “Salute the brethren which are in *Laodicea*, and Nymphas, and the church which is in his house. And, when this Epistle is read among you [*i. e.*, when you have done reading it], *cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans*; AND THAT YE LIKEWISE READ THAT FROM LAODICEA (*τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας*, *i. e.*, the Epistle sent to that city, and which you will get *from it*). No stress can be laid upon De Wette’s argument, that this Laodicean letter must have been written some time before, or else Paul would not now be saluting the Laodiceans through another Church; nor upon the internal evidence that the Epistle to the Colossians was written before that to the Ephesians, for, as they were sent together, this passage may be a postscript, or may refer to a letter which Paul was about to write and send by the same hand. The clear common sense of the passage is, that Paul was sending by Tychicus a letter to Laodicea, as well as this to Colossæ, and that the two Churches were to exchange the reading of the two Epistles.

Now to answer, or fail to answer, the very difficult question, *What and where is the Epistle to the Laodiceans?* is a very long way from the conclusion that it was the “Epistle to the Ephesians.” The appositeness of the identification is just the most suspi-

cious sort of argument; for it is the very consideration that would tempt a speculative critic, like Marcion, to make the identification. Such cases are of constant occurrence in all branches of inquiry. For example, the Greek verb has three Voices; and it has three Perfects; the 1st and 2d Perfect Active, and the 3d form, which is common to the Middle and the Passive: so the grammarians make the symmetrical re-adjustment of assigning one to each Voice, like Cyrus in the fable with the two coats. So Paul sent by Tychicus Epistles to the Colossians and to the Laodiceans. We have the one to the Colossians, and another addressed (in the existing title) to the Ephesians. But now the Epistle to the Laodiceans is wanting: so take the one away from the Ephesians and give it to the Laodiceans! Assuredly far stronger direct evidence than we possess is required to justify this redistribution of

Epistles, even with such high authorities as Ussher and Paley, Conybeare and Lewin.

The idea of Wieseler, that the Laodicean Epistle is that to Philemon, is open to the like objection, and is negatived by the proofs that Philemon and Onesimus were Colossians. Even commentators must sometimes submit to confess, that when a thing is lost they don't know where it is. All admit the probability that Paul wrote many letters that have been lost; and the general likeness of two Epistles, intended for readers in neighboring cities, may be a sufficient reason for the preservation of only one. It may however be said, without hesitation, that the apocryphal *Epistola ad Laodiceenses* is a late and clumsy forgery. It exists only in Latin MSS., and is evidently a cento from the Galatians and Ephesians. A full account of it is given by Jones (*On the Canon*, ii. 31-49).



Stairs of the Modern Capitol at Rome.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE LAST DAYS OF ST. PAUL AND ST. PETER; AND THE COMPLETE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH—FROM THE RELEASE OF ST. PAUL TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM, A.D. 63-70.

§ 1. St. Paul's movements after his release—General indications of the Pastoral Epistles. § 2. Difficulties of detail—Scheme of Mr. Lewin: St. Paul sails for Jerusalem; and goes thence, by Antioch and Asia Minor, visiting Colossæ, to Ephesus. § 3. His labors at Ephesus—State of the Ephesian Church, as shown in the Epistles to Timothy—Church organization—Appearance of heresies. § 4. St. Paul's visit to Crete—Commissions of, and Epistles to, TIMOTHY at Ephesus, and TITUS in Crete—Charges to them—Nature of their office. § 5. The work of Timothy at Ephesus—His peculiar trials. § 6. New forms of error; as developments of Judaism—Combination of superstition and philosophy, of ritualism and libertinism—Germs of future heresies—The Great Apostasy—Mysticism, Asceticism and Gnosticism—Severity of Paul in rebuking these heresies. § 7. Further account of them in the *Second Epistle to Timothy*—Heresy of Hymenæus and Philetus, that the Resurrection was past—Moral corruption—Its prevalence at Crete—*Epistle to Titus*. § 8. Paul visits Macedonia and Corinth, and winters at Nicopolis—Gessius Florus in Judæa—The burning of Rome, and Nero's persecution of the Christians—Testimony of Tacitus to Christ and the Christians. § 9. Movements of St. Paul—Tradition of his journey to

Spain—The presumptive arguments and direct testimony examined. § 10. Last stage of the Apostle's course—*Second Epistle to Timothy*—Paul probably arrested at Ephesus, on the information of Alexander the brass-founder—Indications of his route to Rome as a prisoner. § 11. St. Paul's second imprisonment at Rome—He is treated as a felon, unto bonds: but the word of God is not bound—New converts: *Pudens* and *Claudia*; their supposed British origin—His first hearing and deliverance from "the Lion"—Was it before Nero in person? § 12. The interval before his death—Loneliness: constancy of *Luke* and apostasy of *Demas*—*Mark*—Motives of the urgent invitation to *Timothy*—Prospects of martyrdom—The Apostle's course is finished. § 13. His death and burial—Discussion of the date. § 14. Personal appearance and character of St. Paul—Early attacks on him—The *Clementines*. § 15. ST. PETER associated by tradition with St. Paul in martyrdom—Review of his life—His last appearance in the *Acts*—His probable occupations—Supposed connection with the Church of Corinth. § 16. His relations to the Churches of Asia—His *First Epistle*, written from *Babylon*—State of the Babylonian Jews. § 17. *Silvanus* and *Mark* the companions of Peter—Indications of intercourse with Paul—Designed harmony of the Epistle with Paul's teaching. § 18. Pauline style of the Epistle accounted for by Peter's study of Paul's Epistles and his connection with *Silvanus*. § 19. Discussion of the tradition of St. Peter's episcopate at Rome—Evidence of his late visit to Rome, and his crucifixion there under Nero—St. Peter not the Founder or resident head of the Church of Rome—His own testimony to the true Rock and spiritual Stones of the Church. § 20. The departure of Peter and Paul, and the end of Nero's reign, the epoch of the complete establishment of the Church, which now replaces the local habitation of God on earth; fulfilling our Lord's prophecy of his coming in the destruction of Jerusalem, the type of his last Advent.

§ 1. THE argument at the end of the last chapter led us to the conclusion that, after his imprisonment at Rome had lasted for two years, Paul was heard by Nero and set at liberty. Moreover we inferred from the Epistle to the Hebrews that he was purposing to make use of his recovered freedom in order to pay a visit to his brethren in Judæa, who needed the strongest comfort and confirmation in the terrible trials which now beset both their church and nation. For further light our only certain guidance is to be found in the Pastoral Epistles;¹ of which the first to Timothy and that to Titus are nearly contemporaneous, and the second to Timothy the latest. From them, without encroaching on the domain of conjecture, we draw the following conclusions.² (1.) St. Paul,

¹ For the full discussion of the genuineness of these Epistles, see the articles on them in the *Dictionary of the Bible*.

² It is true that there are many critics, including Wieseler and Dr. Davidson, who admit the genuine-

ness of these Epistles, and yet, by referring 1 Timothy and Titus to an earlier period, and by strained explanations of the allusions in 2 Timothy, get rid of the evidence they are generally understood to give in favor of a second imprisonment. The voyages

at some time after leaving Rome, must have visited Asia Minor and Greece; for he says to Timothy,³ "I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I was setting out for Macedonia." After being once at Ephesus, he was purposing to go there again,⁴ and he spent a considerable time at Ephesus.⁵ (2.) He paid a visit to Crete, and left Titus to organize churches there.⁶ He was intending to spend a winter at one of the places named Nicopolis.⁷ (3) He traveled by Miletus,⁸ Troas⁹ (where he left a cloak or case and some books), and Corinth.¹⁰ (4.) He is a prisoner at Rome, "suffering unto bonds as an evil-doer,"¹¹ and expecting to be soon condemned to death.¹² At this time he felt deserted and solitary, having only Luke, of his old associates, to keep him company; and he was very anxious that Timothy should come to him without delay from Ephesus, and bring Mark with him.¹³

The *end* of the period covered by these movements is that also of the Apostle's whole career, and the Epistles themselves furnish strong arguments for placing them near together and at a date as advanced as possible in the history of the Apostle and the Church. The peculiarities of style and diction by which these are distinguished from all his former Epistles, the affectionate anxieties of an old man and the glances frequently thrown back on earlier times and scenes, the disposition to be hortatory rather than speculative, the references to a more complete and settled organization of the Church, the signs of a condition tending to moral corruption, and resembling that described in the apocalyptic letters to the Seven Churches—would incline us to adopt the latest date which has been suggested for the death of St. Paul, so as to interpose as much time as possible between the Pastoral Epistles and the former group. This view would allow for the *possibility* of a period between *Philippians* and *Hebrews and I. Timothy* covered by no Scriptural records or even allusions.

§ 2. As to further details, we are encountered by immense

required by the two former Epistles, and the writing of them, are placed within the three years spent chiefly at Ephesus (Acts xx. 81). But the hypothesis of voyages during that period not recorded by St. Luke is far more arbitrary than that of a release from Rome, which is objected to expressly because it is arbitrary; and such a distribution of the Pastoral Epistles is shown by overwhelming

evidence to be untenable. The whole question is discussed in a masterly and decisive manner by Alford in his *Prolegomena* to the Pastoral Epistles.

³ 1 Tim. i. 3. ⁴ 1 Tim. iv. 13.

⁵ 2 Tim. i. 18. ⁶ Tit. i. 5.

⁷ Tit. iii. 12. ⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 20.

⁹ 2 Tim. iv. 13. ¹⁰ 2 Tim. iv. 20.

¹¹ 2 Tim. ii. 9. ¹² 2 Tim. iv. 6.

¹³ 2 Tim. i. 15, iv. 16, 9-12.

difficulties from the paucity of materials and the multitude of opinions. The simplest and most condensed scheme is that of Mr. Lewin, based entirely upon the Epistles,¹⁴ to the exclusion of ecclesiastical tradition, except for the time of the Apostle's martyrdom. He supposes that St. Paul, released from his imprisonment in the spring of A.D. 63, sailed, as he had promised, for Jerusalem. Here he would be in no small danger, especially from his old enemy, the ex-high-priest Ananias, whose influence (Josephus tells us) was now at its height. Besides, he would be eager to revisit the scenes of his special labors, and to execute his purpose of confirming those Asiatic churches which "had not seen his face in the flesh," but for which he had "had so great a conflict" in spirit, Colossæ, Laodicea, and Hierapolis.¹⁵ When therefore we meet him next, leaving Ephesus, on his way to Macedonia,¹⁶ it is reasonable to suppose that he made a circuit—like those of former days—by Antioch and Asia Minor, staying at Colossæ, where he had asked Philemon to prepare him a lodging.¹⁷

§ 3. That the Apostle would spend a considerable time at the city which had been so long the scene of his former labors is probable in itself; and the First Epistle to Timothy proves the magnitude of his work there. The Gentile Churches, left to themselves during the Apostle's five years' absence—and in particular that of Ephesus, which we may perhaps regard as a type of the rest—had begun to feel the want of a more perfect organization; and we may venture to say that to complete that organization was a chief providential end of the Apostle's release. Beginning it himself, and carrying it out through the ministry of Timothy here, as of Titus in Crete, he had occasion to place on permanent record, in the Epistles written to direct their action, the great principles of ecclesiastical order.

These Epistles also prove that heretical opinions, corrupt practices, and personal ambitions—the evils of which he forewarned the Ephesian Elders when he parted from them at Miletus¹⁸—had grown to a head during his long absence,

¹⁴ That is, on the *facts* stated in the Pastoral Epistles, and on the *intentions* indicated in the former group, those written during Paul's First Imprisonment. Lewin, *Life of St. Paul*, and *Fasti Sacri*.

¹⁵ Col. ii. 1, iv. 13.

¹⁶ 1 Tim. i. 3. Dr. Howson applies this passage to a second visit

to Ephesus, on Paul's return from his (supposed) journey to Spain. Passing over the voyage to Jerusalem, he supposes the Apostle to have gone from Rome, by way of Macedonia (Phil. ii. 24), to Ephesus, and thence to have paid his promised visit to Colossæ.

¹⁷ Philem. 22.

¹⁸ Acts xx. 19, 20.

and needed to be firmly repressed. It seems, therefore, not unreasonable to suppose that Paul spent the whole winter of 63–64 at Ephesus, if indeed that time be not all too short for what he had to do. In fact he seems to have made the city his head-quarters at this period, for, when he leaves it for Macedonia, he contemplates returning as soon as possible, and treats the commission that he leaves with Timothy as an episode in his own government of the Ephesian Church.¹⁹

§ 4. Early in A.D. 64 (according to Mr. Lewin's scheme) Paul left Timothy at Ephesus as his representative—a *vicar-apostolic* rather than a *bishop*—while he himself sailed with Titus to Crete, to correct abuses similar to those which had grown up at Ephesus. Leaving Titus there to complete this work, with the same authority with which Timothy was invested, he returned to Ephesus, to prepare for a visit to his other chief field of labor in Macedonia and Greece, according to his promise to the Philippians.²⁰ Timothy, who would gladly have accompanied his spiritual father, as on former journeys, was prevailed upon to continue his work at Ephesus, for which Paul gave him a solemn charge.²¹ It is important to observe how emphatically St. Paul dwells on this idea of a *charge* throughout the Epistles to Timothy and Titus—a charge for them to keep themselves, and to enforce on all the Church—bishops and deacons, men and women, rich and poor, faithful disciples and factious opponents. Nor is it less interesting to notice the new phase which this arrangement exhibits in the history of Christianity. The Churches, hitherto accustomed to look for guidance to their apostolic founders, are now entrusted to the delegated authority of comparative-

¹⁹ See 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15, and the "till I come" in iv. 15. ²⁰ Phil. ii. 24.

²¹ 1 Tim. i. 3, 4: *Καθὼς παρὲκ ἄλεσά σε προσμείναι*. Mr. Lewin remarks that the word *προσμείναι*, to stay on, implies first that Paul had previously placed Timothy in the position he filled at Ephesus, and secondly that, on his departure for Macedonia, he had desired him to continue there. It is impossible to make out with complete exactness the relations between the missions of, and the Epistles to, Timothy and Titus. This alone is clear, that they were placed at Ephesus and Crete under similar circumstances, and about the same time; and that the

Epistles to them were nearly contemporaneous; but the details are very doubtful, though various satisfactory theories may be framed. One such view is that Paul made two distinct voyages from Ephesus, one to Macedonia and the other to Crete; that on the former he wrote the 1st Epistle to Timothy, and that to Titus after his return to Ephesus from the latter visit, when he was on the point of starting for Nicopolis by way of Miletus and Corinth. Other possible combinations may be seen in Birks (*Horæ Apostolicæ*, at the end of his edition of the *Horæ Paulinæ*, pp. 299–301), and in Wordsworth (*Greek Test.* pt. iii. pp. 418, 421).

ly young men, who, furnished by Paul with full instructions, are to train them for self-government in the coming age, when the Apostles shall have departed from the earth.

The experiment is the more interesting from its being made in no quiet times of settled faith and union; and perhaps the difficulties that surrounded it may have been a reason for the Apostle's withdrawal for a time, to watch from a distance the working of his exhortations in other hands. It is clear from the First Epistle to Timothy that at Ephesus, as formerly at Corinth, there was a factious opposition against himself; and, like Lycurgus or Solon, retiring from the republics where they left their laws to work the more freely, Paul might feel that his admonitions would be better felt in their own intrinsic force, when worked out by other hands.

§ 5. The work and difficulties that were thus handed over are vividly portrayed in the First Epistle to Timothy. He had to rule presbyters, most of whom were older than himself,²² to assign to each a stipend in proportion to his work,²³ to receive and decide on charges that might be brought against them,²⁴ to regulate the alms-giving and the sisterhoods of the Church,²⁵ to ordain presbyters and deacons.²⁶ There was the risk of being entangled in the disputes, prejudices, covetousness, sensuality, of a great city. There was the risk of injuring health and strength by an overstrained asceticism.²⁷ Leaders of rival sects were there—Hymenæus, Philetus, Alexander—to oppose and thwart him.²⁸ The name of his beloved teacher was no longer honored as it had been; the strong affection of former days had vanished, and "Paul the aged" had become unpopular, the object of suspicion and dislike.²⁹ Only in the narrowed circle of the faithful few—Aquila, Priscilla, Mark, and others, who were still with him—was he likely to find sympathy or support.³⁰ We can not wonder that the Apostle, knowing these trials, and, with his marvelous power of bearing another's burdens and making them his own, should be full of anxiety and fear for his disciples' steadfastness; that admonitions, appeals, warnings, should follow each other in rapid and vehement succession.³¹

§ 6. It is a deeply interesting question in the early history

²² 1 Tim. iv. 12.

²³ 1 Tim. v. 12.

²⁴ 1 Tim. v. 1, 19, 20.

²⁵ 1 Tim. v. 3-10.

²⁶ 1 Tim. iii. 1-13.

²⁷ 1 Tim. iv. 4, v. 23.

²⁸ 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 17, iv. 14, 15.

²⁹ Comp. Acts xx. 37, and 2 Tim. i. 15. ³⁰ 2 Tim. iv. 19.

³¹ 1 Tim. i. 18, iii. 15, iv. 14, v. 21, vi. 11.

of Christianity, what were the precise evils and errors in the Church of Ephesus which moved all this anxiety. The answer is furnished by those many allusions which show the sad spectacle of new forms of error infecting the Church. It is indeed most strange that this should have been turned into an argument against the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, when we trace the rapid spread of Oriental mysticism and asceticism on the one hand, and of the Alexandrian philosophy on the other—among Jews as well as Greeks—as seen in the Cabbala and in Philo, and when we have heard Paul already denouncing the like mixture of errors in his Epistle to the Colossians.²² It was expressly against new forms of error, about to arise among them after his departure, that the Apostle had warned the Ephesian Elders at Miletus; nor will any one acquainted with the history of heresies be surprised that five years were sufficient for their development, much less when he sees how many were rife in these very Asiatic churches, when St. John wrote to them in the Apocalypse. The fatal though seemingly unnatural alliance had already been contracted between ritualism and rationalism, as we now say, or, in the language of that age, between Judaism and Gnosticism. “The East and West were infusing their several elements of poison into the pure cup of Gospel truth. In Asia Minor, as at Alexandria, Hellenic philosophism did not refuse to blend with Oriental theosophy; the Jewish superstitions of the Cabbala, and the wild speculations of the Persian Magi, were combined with Greek craving for an enlightened and esoteric religion. *The outward forms of superstition were ready for the vulgar multitude; the interpretation was confined to the aristocracy of knowledge, the self-styled Gnostics.*”²³

The simple and sad truth is, that as soon as Christianity was generally diffused, it began to absorb corruptions from

²² Col. ii. 8-23, where the *φιλοσοφία* of ver. 8 answers to the *γνώσις* of 1 Tim. vi. 20.

²³ 1 Tim. vi. 20. Howson, *St. Paul*, vol. ii. p. 548. Baur's objection to the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, on the ground that the errors denounced belong to the Gnosticism of Marcion (a century later), is decisively answered by the distinctly *Judaistic* teaching of the heretics at Ephesus. A strong confirmation of our view is found in the further development of error, as well as of per-

sonal opposition to the Apostle, between the First and Second Epistles to Timothy. In the first, for example, Hymenæus and Alexander are denounced, in general terms, as apostates and blasphemers (1 Tim. i. 20): in the second, we see that Alexander's personal opposition to the Apostle has become still more virulent (2 Tim. iv. 14, 15); and Hymenæus is associated with a new name, Philetus, as teachers of the specific doctrine, that “the resurrection is passed already.”

all the countries that it covered, and to reflect the complexion of all the religious and philosophic systems to which it was opposed. But, in the Apostolic age, the Judaizers are still the leaders of the hosts of error, and gather all the rest under their banner. And this can only seem an anomaly to those who confound Judaism with Pharisaism, forgetting the Sadducean element; or who overlook the latitudinarian opinions of the Hellenists. Side by side with the old Jewish spirit of self-righteousness, there had grown up a Jewish libertinism, which, satisfying the conscience by insisting on the outward forms of the Mosaic Law, embraced the wildest errors from every quarter of the heathen world. Both forms of Judaism soon infected the Christian Church, which—as Paul expressly tells us—was corrupted not only by the errors of sincere converts, but by false brethren who had crept in unawares. The open opponents, who had sacrificed Christ for fear of Cæsar, were succeeded by feigned disciples, who found in Christian liberty an excuse for the dissolution of social and political bonds, and the hope of a millenium of sensuality and self-will.

The chief seat of this heresy was in Asia Minor, where the Jewish synagogues had been brought into close contact with the remnants of Hellenic liberty and the practice of Oriental licentiousness. In the remoter provinces of the peninsula, where the Oriental element was strongest and the Jews of the Dispersion were the most numerous, the heresy assumed those grosser forms which are exposed in the Epistles of Peter and Jude, and which, as we learn from the Apocalypse, soon became rampant even in the refined province of Asia. But the evil had not as yet reached this height at Ephesus. Libertinism of opinion was kept in countenance by ritualistic zeal, and a pretended asceticism had as yet but partially given place to its natural successor, libertinism in practice. The false teachers of the Pastoral Epistles are predominantly Jewish, “claiming to be *teachers of the law*, not understanding either what they talk or what they are confident of,” whose “vain janglings” (*ματαιλογία*) consisted in those “*foolish questions, fables, endless genealogies, contentions and strivings about the law*,” which formed the mass of Rabbinical learning.” “*The law is good*,” seems to have been the catch-word

²⁴ 1 Tim. i. 4, 6, 7; Titus iii. 9. The wildness of Baur's views is almost sufficiently exposed by the fact that he makes *νομοδιδάσκαλοι* Antinomian teachers, and the *μαχαὶ νομικαὶ* Antinomian doctrine. The “fables” are expressly called “*Jewish fables*” in the Epistle to Titus (i. 14), and the false teachers are said to be “*especially those of the circumcision*.”

which they opposed to the doctrine of grace taught by Paul, who replies with as keen irony as profound truth, *the law is good if used lawfully*,—as a restraint on those crimes of which these teachers were ready to be at least tolerant, but which he sternly denounces as *contrary to sound doctrine*, “according to the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.”³⁵

The combination of Oriental theosophy and reverence for intermediate spirits with asceticism, which Paul had already opposed in the Colossian Church, he now speaks of as working in germs which the Spirit expressly foretold by him were to receive a fearful development in “the latter times,” as he elsewhere calls them, the “last days:” those *perilous times* of which John, Peter and Jude also write, with more special reference to their moral enormities.³⁶ The use of the *same word*, added to the like features, marks this as the *Great Apostasy* of which Paul had long since written to the Thessalonians,³⁷ where—lest any should suppose that we are confounding prophecies with facts—he expressly says, “The mystery of iniquity doth already work.”³⁸ The “last time” of conflict between truth and error had, in fact, begun. Whatever future development this *mystery of Antichrist* might hereafter assume in positive systems of superstition or infidelity, or both combined,³⁹ its principles were already at work. Some had begun to depart from the faith, seduced by “erratic spirits”⁴⁰ into the belief of “doctrines about in-

³⁵ 1 Tim. i. 8-11.

³⁶ 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 3; 1 John ii. 18; Jude 18. Here also we see the progress of declension between the First Epistle and the Second, in which Paul denounces that same development of the heresy, striking at the foundations of morality and social order, which Peter and Jude expose. This fact, coupled with Peter's allusion to what Paul had written of these very things (2 Pet. iii. 15), is a most important datum for fixing the relation between the time and work of the two Apostles.

³⁷ Comp. 2 Thess. ii. 3, ἡ ἀποστασία (*the falling away*, A.V.), with 1 Tim. iv. 1, ἀποστήσουσι τινες τῆς πίστεως (*some shall depart from the faith*, A.V.). Our Version conceals the parallel.

³⁸ 2 Thess. i. 7: comp. 1 John ii. 18, “*Even now are there many antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time.*”

³⁹ It may be observed in passing, that many writers on the prophecies of Paul and John, who have labored to show what in these predictions refers to Popery, and what to Infidelity, have overlooked the close intermixture of the two elements of superstition and unbelief, both in the heresies denounced by the Apostle, and in the systems in which they seek to trace their fulfillment. This paradoxical alliance has always existed, and always will, for reasons founded in human nature itself.

⁴⁰ 1 Tim. iv. 1. It seems clear that the word *spirits* (πνεύμασι πλάνοις) is here used in the sense of *persons professing to speak by inspiration*, as in 1

ferior deities” “through the hypocrisy of false teachers who had first their own conscience hardened as by a cautery,” “and who, as at Colossæ, mingled asceticism with their mysticism, “forbidding to marry, and enjoining abstinence from foods—things which God has ordained to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth.” In opposition to all such teaching, the Apostle lays down the great principle—“*Every creature of God is good, and none to be rejected, when taken with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.*” “All these errors are summed up—in opposition to that truth which Paul describes as a *trust* (or *deposit*) committed to Timothy “—as “the profane babblings and oppositions of the *falsely named knowledge*,” a word which not only suggests the fearful developments of these errors in the *Gnosticism* of the next century, but indicates that the name had already been assumed.” In contrast with this summary of the mysteries of error, the Epistle gives us a noble epitome of the Christian faith, introduced by words which have been thought to indicate a passage from a hymn or creed: “And, *as is confessed,*

Cor. xii. 10, 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2 Thess. ii. 2, and especially 1 John iv. 1-3, 6, which refers to these very errors. The epithet *πλάνος* (literally *wandering*) is used for an *impostor* or *deceiver* in classical Greek and by Josephus, as well as in the N. T., Matt. xxvii. 68, 2 Cor. vi. 8, 2 John 7. Comp. the *πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης* of 1 John iv. 6, and the figure of Jude (13) for the false teachers, *ἀστέρες πλανῆται* (i. e., comets, or *meteors*).

⁴¹ *διδασκαλίας δαιμονίων.*

⁴² 1 Tim. iv. 2, *ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγων κεκαυτηριασμένων τὴν ἰδίαν συνείδησιν.* The difficulties of the commentators about the genitive are removed by taking the *ἐν* in its frequent *instrumental* sense.

⁴³ 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5: comp. Titus i. 15. This rebuke of asceticism throws light upon the reason for the introduction into the Epistle of a matter so personal as—“Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach’s sake, and thine often infirmities” (1 Tim. v. 23). The connection of this advice with the warnings, “Be not partaker of other

men’s sins: keep thyself pure” (v. 22), and “flee youthful lusts” (2 Tim. ii. 22), has suggested the opinion that Timothy, exposed by his sensitive nature to sensual temptations, had been led to asceticism as an antidote. It deserves special notice how earnestly, in both the Epistles, Paul admonishes Timothy himself to preserve that purity and sound doctrine which he was to inculcate upon others.

⁴⁴ 1 Tim. vi. 20, *τὴν παραθήκην*: comp. 2 Tim. i. 14, Tit. i. 9, Rev. iii. 8.

⁴⁵ Ibid. *τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου Γνωσεως.* The word *ἀντιθέσεις*, which occurs only here, is most naturally interpreted of the rhetorical refinements of the self-styled philosophers. It may possibly refer to the *dualistic* doctrines of good and evil, which were imported from the East; but Baur only exposes the rashness of the Tübingen school, when he finds in the word an allusion to the *Ἀντιθέσεις* or *Contrariæ Oppositiones* (Contrasts between the Law and Gospel) of Marcion.

great is the mystery of godliness [or religion]: God was manifested in the flesh; justified by the spirit; seen of angels; preached among the Gentiles; believed on in the world; received up into glory;" and he points to the Church as the pillar and foundation laid on earth for the support of this doctrine.⁴⁶

Another significant link between this and the next age of the Church, as to the growing sharpness of the conflict with error, is seen in the fact that the Apostle, who had written to the Corinthians so tenderly, though firmly, of an arch-offender, now first brands opponents by name; and, though his injunctions to deal firmly with the offense are not plainer than before, he speaks with more severity of the offenders, as men who, "having put away a good conscience, have made shipwreck concerning faith, of whom is *Hymenæus* and *Alexander*, whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." "The Epistle to Titus enjoins the like firmness in dealing with HERETICS, *a word which here first occurs in its common ecclesiastical sense.*"⁴⁸

§ 7. When we pass to the Second Epistle to Timothy, we learn *what* was the precise heresy thus denounced; and now in terms of increased severity. For the "profane and vain babblings" had themselves "increased unto more ungodliness,"⁴⁹ and their word was beginning "to devour like a cancer: of whom are *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, who concerning the truth have erred, saying that *the resurrection has taken place already.*"⁵⁰ The denial of a resurrection of the body was no new error in the Church; but was the natural result of Sadducean corruption. The famous argument of the Apostle seems to imply that in the Church of Corinth it did not go beyond the simple negation—"that there is no resurrection of the dead."⁵¹ But these pretenders to a higher spiritual philosophy than the Gospel held that *it was already accomplished*; no doubt in the sense soon after taught by the Gnostics, that the only Resurrection was the rising of the soul from the death of ignorance to the life and light of knowledge.⁵²

Nor is the transition less marked to a more severe denunci-

⁴⁶ 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16.

⁴⁷ 1 Tim. i. 19, 20. The *παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ* is the very phrase used in 1 Cor. v. 5. It is regarded by some as a Jewish formula of excommunication, referring to Satan as the prince of the world, into which the offender was cast out of the Church.

But see *Notes and Illustrations*, on "Hymenæus and his Heresy."

⁴⁸ Tit. iii. 10.

⁴⁹ 2 Tim. ii. 16: comp. 1 Tim. vi. 20. ⁵⁰ 2 Tim. ii. 17-18.

⁵¹ 1 Cor. xv.

⁵² See *Notes and Illustrations*, "Hymenæus and his Heresy."

ation of moral corruption. The chief evil rebuked in the First Epistle is that love of riches which was a natural corruption in the wealthy province of Asia, and which gave occasion to Paul's magnificent homily on their true use.⁵³ But now he draws a picture of sensual vice, and self-willed rebellion against the first laws of social order, precisely parallel to the description of Peter and Jude.⁵⁴ And a comparison of the Epistle to Titus with the First to Timothy proves that this class of evils had made more rapid progress among the coarser Dorians of Crete, whose character the Apostle describes by a verse of their own pet poet Epimenides—

Κρήτ' ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστερὲς ἀργαί.

"Always liars are the Cretans, evil beasts and natures slow."⁵⁵

In this Epistle, as in the First to Timothy, Paul sums up the principles opposed to those errors in a formula of truth;⁵⁶ which he finally condenses, in the Second Epistle to Timothy, into a twofold motto, fit to be inscribed on the two faces of that base on which the Church was reared as the pillar of the truth—the one looking toward heaven, and the other toward earth:—"Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal—

"THE LORD KNOWETH THEM THAT ARE HIS. And:

"LET EVERY ONE THAT NAMETH THE NAME OF CHRIST DEPART FROM INIQUITY."⁵⁷

§ 8. At what stage of Paul's journey westward these Epistles⁵⁸ were dispatched, is altogether uncertain. Mr. Lewin thinks from Corinth, which the Apostle, traveling by way of the Isthmus, would visit on his way to Nicopolis, and where he would be likely to make a considerable stay. The direction of his journey is fixed by his determination to winter at Nicopolis, at least if it is rightly assumed that he means Nicop-

⁵³ 1 Tim. vi. 5-10, 17-19.

⁵⁴ 2 Tim. iii. 1-9.

⁵⁵ Tit. i. 12. The quotation, and the Apostle's testimony to its truth (ver. 13), derive the greater force from the *oracular* character attributed to the verses of Epimenides, whom Paul therefore calls, with a touch of irony, a *prophet*. He was a native of Crete, and lived in the 6th century B.C. The context shows the vehement severity with which Paul denounces the false teachers at Crete.

They seem to have been more distinctively Jewish than those of Asia, as might be expected from our having no account of the evangelization of the island, except what may be inferred from the presence of Cretans at Jerusalem on the great day of Pentecost.

⁵⁶ Tit. ii. 11-14.

⁵⁷ 2 Tim. ii. 19.

⁵⁸ The First to Timothy and that to Titus. The Second to Timothy was later, and written from Rome.

olis in Epirus; and the importance of his visit to this city may be inferred from his direction to Titus to join him there, with Zenas the lawyer and Apollos, in case he should send for him."

The winter spent by Paul at Nicopolis closed a year marked by great events, which were destined to hasten both his own end and his country's (A.D. 64).⁶⁰ Cestius Gallus became prefect of Syria, and Albinus was succeeded in the procuratorship of Judæa by Gessius Florns, who in less than two years provoked the Jewish war, the portents of which were clearer in the sufferings that grew intolerable on the land, than in the comet that blazed in the sky at the end of the year. Meanwhile a great part of Rome was laid in ruins by the fire that broke out on the anniversary of the burning of the city by the Gauls, and raged nine days.⁶¹ While Nero

⁶⁰ Tit. iii. 12. The subscription to the Epistle assumes that the Apostle was at Nicopolis when he wrote; but we can not conclude this from the form of expression. We should rather infer that he was elsewhere, possibly at Ephesus or Corinth. He urges that no time should be lost (*σπουδασον ἔλθειν*); hence we conclude that winter was near.

Nothing is to be found in the Epistle itself to determine which Nicopolis is here intended. There were cities of this name in Asia, Africa, and Europe. One Nicopolis was in Thrace, near the borders of Macedonia. The subscription (which, however, is of no authority) fixes on this place, calling it the Macedonian Nicopolis: and such is the view of Chrysostom and Theodoret. De Wette's objection to this opinion (*Pastoral Briefe*, p. 21), that the place did not exist till Trajan's reign, appears to be a mistake. Another Nicopolis was in Cilicia; and Schrader (*Der Apostel Paulus*, i. pp. 115-119) pronounces for this; but this opinion is connected with a peculiar theory regarding the Apostle's journeys. We have little doubt that Jerome's view is correct, and that the Pauline Nicopolis was the celebrated city of Epirus ("scribit Apostolus de Nicopoli, quæ in Actiaco littore sita," Hieron. *Proæm.* ix 195).

This city (the "City of Victory") was built by Augustus in memory of the battle of Actium, and on the ground which his army occupied before the engagement. It is a curious and interesting circumstance, when we look at the matter from a Biblical point of view, that many of the handsomest parts of the town were built by Herod the Great (*Joseph. Ant.* xvi. 5, § 3). It is likely enough that many Jews lived there. Moreover, it was conveniently situated for apostolic journeys in the eastern parts of Achaia and Macedonia, and also to the northward, where churches perhaps were founded. St. Paul had long before preached the Gospel at least on the confines of Illyricum (*Rom.* xv. 19), and soon after the very period under consideration Titus himself was sent on a mission to Dalmatia (*2 Tim.* iv. 10).

Nicopolis was on a peninsula to the west of the bay of Actium, in a low and unhealthy situation, and it is now a very desolate place.

⁶¹ This was the year in which the historian Josephus went to Rome, at the age of 26, and on his voyage suffered his shipwreck in Adria, which so strikingly resembles that of St. Paul.

⁶² First for six days (July 19-24), and then, after an interval of six days, for three days more.

took possession of a large part of the space thus cleared (as some said, by his own contrivance) for the erection of his immense palace, called the *Golden House*, he satiated the public indignation, to use the words of Tacitus,⁶² by "casting the charge of the crime and visiting it with exquisite tortures upon those whom, already hated for their wickedness, the people called Christians. This name was derived from one CHRISTUS, who was executed in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator of Judæa, Pontius Pilate; and this accursed superstition, for a moment repressed, broke forth again, not only through Judæa, the source of the evil, but even through the City, whither all things outrageous and shameful flow together, and find many adherents. Accordingly those were first arrested who confessed," afterward a vast number upon their information, who were convicted not so much on the charge of causing the fire as for their hatred to the human race. To their execution were added mockeries such as these: they were wrapped in the skins of wild beasts and torn in pieces by dogs, or crucified, or set on fire and burned, when day-light ended, as torches to light up the night. Nero lent his own gardens for the spectacle, and gave a chariot race at which he mingled freely with the multitude in the garb of a driver, or mounted on his chariot. As the result of all, a feeling of compassion arose for the sufferers, though guilty and deserving of condign punishment, on the ground that they were destroyed, not for the common good, but to gratify the cruelty of one man."

Mournful as it is to hear the great historian venting upon the Christians the same prejudices that we have seen him uttering against the Jews,⁶³ it may be that evils such as we have seen Paul rebuking at Ephesus had given a pretext for his charges against some who bore the Christian name. Nor should it be overlooked that his historical testimony to the death of Christ, at the time and manner related in the Gospels, is the more valuable for the very scorn that he shows toward the Christians. It was while these events were taking place at Rome that the Temple at Jerusalem was at length completed, more than 80 years after its commencement by Herod, and only five before its final destruction. The discharge of the workmen employed upon the edifice added to the seething materials of the coming eruption.

To what extent the cruelties against the Christians at

⁶² Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44. — ⁶³ That is that they were Christians, not that they burned the city, as is clear from the rest of the sentence. — ⁶⁴ *Hist.* v. 8: see above, p. 29.

Rome were followed up throughout the empire by what ecclesiastical historians call the *First General Persecution*," is a disputed point; but we have sufficient evidence that now the chief leaders of the Christians became obnoxious to the Roman government. The martyrdoms both of Paul and Peter, whatever their precise date, may certainly be referred to this new hostile movement; and Clement of Rome, an authority almost contemporary, tells us that their fate was shared by "a great multitude of the elect, who, suffering many insults and torments through the envy of their adversaries, left the most glorious example among us." "

§ 8. It is supposed by some that St. Paul was now arrested at Nicopolis, and thence carried a prisoner to Rome; but the allusions in the *Second Epistle to Timothy* seem, as we shall see presently, scarcely consistent with any hypothesis but that of a recent departure from Ephesus, under circumstances of sorrow that had arisen after the date of the Epistle to Titus. Besides, Paul's return to Ephesus is just what we should expect from the intentions expressed in the First Epistle to Timothy. If, then, he returned, was it at such a time as to fulfill his hope of "coming shortly," or the other alternative, "if I tarry long?" and, in the latter case, what was the cause of the delay? and was it connected with the motive that carried him to Nicopolis, a station where his face was once more turned toward the Western division of the Empire?

These questions are connected with that most obscure but

" There are usually reckoned *Ten Persecutions* of the Church by the Emperors: (1) Under *Nero*, beginning A.D. 64; (2) under *Domitian*, A.D. 95; (3) under *Trajan*, A.D. 106; (4) under *Marcus Aurelius*, A.D. 166; (5) under *Severus*, A.D. 202; (6) under *Maximin*, A.D. 235; (7) under *Decius*, A.D. 250; (8) under *Valerian*, A.D. 258; (9) under *Aurelian*, A.D. 275; (10) under *Diocletian* and *Maximian*, A.D. 303.

" *Epist. ad Corinth. 5.* CLEMENS ROMANUS, the earliest of the "Apostolic Fathers"—that is those who are believed to have had intercourse with the Apostles themselves—lived about the end of the first century, and is supposed by some to be the Clement mentioned in Phil. iv. 3. The only genuine work extant under his name

is his First Epistle to the Corinthians in Greek. Eusebius says: "Nero ad cætera scelera persecutionem quoque Christianorum primus adjunxit, sub quo Petrus et Paulus Apostoli Martyrium Romæ consummaverunt" (*Chron. Arm. s. a. Neronis XIII. Ol. 211. 4, Ann. Ab. 2083, i. e., A.D. 67-68.* See further on the date, p. 632). Orosius and Lanctantius bear still more direct testimony to a general persecution by Nero; and Sulpicius Severus says that the Christian religion was forbidden by laws and public edicts, adding, that, *while these things were done at Rome, the Jews began their rebellion*, provoked by the outrages of Gessius Florus. This statement, however, need not refer to the *very first outbreak* of the Jewish war in A.D. 66.

deeply interesting problem in the Apostle's life, his alleged journey to the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, and in particular to SPAIN. We have seen him informing the Church at Rome of such an intention, as one of the motives that impelled him to visit the capital.⁶⁷ Now, besides the general argument, previously referred to, that the mere statement of an intention can not *of itself* be evidence of its fulfillment, we know, in this case, that the plan was not executed *at the time and in the manner* contemplated by the Apostle. That deliberate and steadfast character of his plans, on which he himself lays so much stress, suggests a presumption that he would ultimately execute this design if the opportunity ever came; but, on the other hand, the same presumption *may be* the only basis for the ecclesiastical tradition, which at first sight appears to furnish independent evidence.⁶⁸ There is another presumption, but purely negative, from the internal evidence of Scripture, compared with the date of the Apostle's martyrdom. If the latest date of A.D. 67-8 be accepted, we have an interval of four or five years from the end of his first imprisonment to his death, a period which the movements referred to in the Pastoral Epistles are insufficient to fill up. It is inferred that this gap may be supplied by the journey to the West, either before or after the writing of the First Epistle to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. The former alternative is usually preferred, in order to bring the Pastoral Epistles close together; while the latter suggests a motive for the wintering at Nicopolis. Another indirect argument is found in the greater safety which the Western Provinces, then under the government of distinguished men who chafed under the tyranny of Nero (Galba and Vindex), would afford to the Apostle during the Neronian persecution, while he was prosecuting his cherished purpose of evangelizing those regions.

It remains to see what positive evidence we have for the general belief of antiquity, that Paul visited the West. The first writer quoted in support of the journey to Spain is one whose evidence would indeed be irresistible, if the language in which it is expressed were less obscure. CLEMENT OF ROME, in a hortatory and rather rhetorical passage, refers to St. Paul as an example of patience, and mentions that he preached "both in the East and in the West," and that be-

⁶⁷ Rom. xv. 24-28.

⁶⁸ This suspicion is the more natural, as the tradition mentions only *Spain*, and not the parts of *Gaul* about Massilia, where we find Christianity flourishing in the 2d century.

fore his martyrdom he went "to the goal of the West,"⁶⁰ which may describe either Spain or some more distant country.⁶¹ Another testimony, which mentions less ambiguously a "*profectionem Pauli ab urbe in Spaniam proficiscentis*," is doubtful through the imperfection of the text.⁶² Chrysostom says that after Paul had been in Rome, he again departed to Spain;⁶³ and Jerome speaks of the Apostle as set free by Nero that he might preach the Gospel of Christ "in the parts of the West."⁶⁴ It is worthy of notice that all these testimonies make the visit to Spain an *immediate* consequence of the Apostle's liberation. Ewald, who denies the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, and therefore rejects the journeyings in Greece and Asia Minor, yields to the testimony of tradition in favor of the journey to Spain.

§ 10. Returning from this doubtful ground, we come to the evidence furnished by the *Second Epistle to Timothy* to the last stage of the Apostle's course. The main fact, that he was now a prisoner at Rome, with a certain and immediate prospect of his martyrdom, admits of no doubt to those who receive the Epistle as genuine;⁶⁵ nor are indications wanting

⁶⁰ *Epist. I. ad Cor. 5*: ἐν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει . . . ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δίσεως. The omission of any specific mention of Spain is very suspicious. Nay, the connection of the passage with the account of Paul's martyrdom suggests that, after all, the τέρμα τῆς δίσεως may simply mark Rome as the Western goal of Paul's labors, having reached which, "and borne his testimony before the rulers, he was released from life." (See below, § 13.)

⁶¹ For the tradition that St. Paul preached in Britain there is no known evidence beyond conjecture; but it may be convenient here to notice the evidence for the early evangelization of the British islands, which is often confounded with the introduction of Christianity among the Saxons by Augustine in A.D. 597. But these heathen conquerors, in their extirpation of Roman civilization, had overwhelmed an earlier British church, of whose existence we have evidence in the attendance of its bishops at councils, in the death of its proto-martyr St. Alban in Diocletian's per-

secution, and in the origin of the Pelagian heresy in Britain; to say nothing of the Christian king Lucius, who is alleged to have sent an embassy to Eleutherus, the bishop of Rome, in the time of the Antonines. After giving, however, the greatest reasonable weight to this evidence, we have no positive indications of the evangelization of Britain before a somewhat advanced period in the second century.

⁶² Muratori's Fragment on the Canon, *ap. Routh, Reliq. Sac.* vol. iv. pp. 1-12. The passage is fully discussed by Alford, *Greek Test.* vol. iii. p. 93.

⁶³ On 2 Tim. iv. 20: Μετὰ τὸ γενοῦσθαι ἐν Ῥώμῃ, πάλιν εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν ἀπῆλθεν.

⁶⁴ *Cat. Script. Eccles.* s. v. *Paulus*: "in Occidentis quoque partibus."

⁶⁵ 2 Tim. i. 8, 12, 16, ii. 9-13, iv. 6-8, 16-18. For the *place*, iv. 17 is decisive. For a discussion of the extravagant hypothesis, that the Epistle was written during the *First* Imprisonment at Rome, and *before* the other two Pastoral Epistles, see *Dict. of Bible*, art. TIMOTHY, EPISTLES TO.

of the steps that had led him to this his last imprisonment. The allusions to various details, personal as well as public, bear all the impress of what is *recent*. One of these seems to prove that Titus had joined him at Nicopolis, as Paul had wished, and had been sent into the neighboring region of Dalmatia;⁷⁷ and we gather from others that the Apostle had recently been at Corinth,⁷⁸ at Troas,⁷⁹ at Miletus,⁸⁰ and at Ephesus, where he had been subjected to the bitter trial of a general desertion on the part of the Asiatic Christians, under two leaders, whose names now first appear—*Phygellus* and *Hermogenes*—but where he had been ministered to by *Onesiphorus*, the same devoted disciple who, regardless of disgrace and danger, had diligently sought him out at Rome.⁸¹ Lastly, those *tears* of Timothy, the tender recollection of which the Apostle carried into his person,⁸² not only point—as all agree—to a recent separation, but to such a scene as must have taken place if Timothy saw his father in the faith dragged away from Ephesus as a prisoner; such a scene as had formerly been witnessed at Paul's parting from the Elders of Ephesus,⁸³ and again at Cæsarea, when he seemed to be advancing to a martyr's death at Jerusalem.⁸⁴

These indications tend to confirm the theory that St. Paul was arrested at Ephesus during the Neronian persecution; a cause to which we may refer the desertion of the Asiatics. Indeed the later treatment of the Apostle by this church is in striking agreement with the remonstrance of St. John, "*Because thou hast left thy first love.*"⁸⁵ There remains one in-

The following is one of those indications from minute facts, which are peculiarly satisfactory. "Erastus abode at Corinth, but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick" (2 Tim. iv. 20). On the voyage preceding Paul's imprisonment Trophimus was not left at Miletus, but went on with him to Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 29); and assuredly the ship, when blown off from Cnidus to Crete, did not put him ashore at Miletus (Acts xxvii. 5, 6). And Erastus, instead of "remaining at Corinth," left that city with the Apostle (Acts xx. 4).

⁷⁷ 2 Tim. iv. 10. It is not necessary to suppose that Titus had been sent *from Rome*; for his mission is only mentioned to account for his absence.

⁷⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 20.

⁷⁷ 2 Tim. iv. 13.

⁷⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 20.

⁷⁹ 2 Tim. i. 15-18. The suggestion that the allusion to Onesiphorus is a reminiscence of a former period, and that his ministrations at Rome were antecedent to those at Ephesus, and consequently refer to the first imprisonment, seems to us opposed to the general tone of these allusions, and especially to the fact that the blessing invoked on Onesiphorus and his household for these proofs of his fearless attachment follows immediately upon the complaint of the desertion of the Asiatics.

⁸⁰ 2 Tim. i. 4.

⁸¹ Acts xx. 37.

⁸² Acts xxi. 13.

⁸³ Rev. ii. 4. The other characteristics of works, labor and patience

dication, which has been generally overlooked, of the very circumstances that led to St. Paul's arrest. The sentence—"Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord reward him according to his works!"—has suggested painful feelings to many a reader, which assuredly would not be soothed by the belief that it is the utterance of resentment for the part taken by Alexander in the riot at Ephesus some ten years before!⁶⁴ But the passage appears in a very different light in the version of Dr. Howson: "Alexander the brass-founder *charged me with much evil in his declaration*; the Lord shall reward him according to his works!"⁶⁵ Whether we suppose the Alexander whom the Jews put forward to make his defense to the Ephesians at the great riot to have been a Jew or a Christian,⁶⁶ we are not surprised to meet him again as a Judaizing teacher in the Church; nor that, in revenge for his excommunication,⁶⁷ he should have laid an information against Paul during the great Neronian persecution; for in all such proceedings informers were numerous and busy. That Alexander was now at Ephesus seems clear from the charge to Timothy, "Of whom be thou ware also."⁶⁸ It is of little consequence to inquire whether the allusions to the Apostle's touching at *Troas*, where he left with Carpus the books and parchments, with the traveling-case, which he desires Timothy to bring with him;⁶⁹ at

for Christ's name's sake, under great temptations to faint, of a conflict with wicked men and false Apostles, whom the Church tried and rejected, and with a specific heresy—that of the Nicolaitans—which they abhorred, all agree with the Church of Ephesus, partly such as it is depicted in Paul's life, and partly such as it might become as the result of the Apostle's admonitions and the labors of Timothy.

⁶⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 14, 15.

⁶⁵ There can be no difficulty in taking the phrase *πολλά μοι κακὰ ἐνεδείξατο* in the sense of a *judicial declaration*, which is that of the Active voice in Classical Greek. In the latter clause the best MSS. and Versions vary greatly, and there are obvious reasons why *ἀποδώη* may have been altered into *ἀποδώσει*. Nor need we be staggered at the Apostle's use of language which is not only habitual in the inspired utterances of David

(2 Sam. iii. 39; Ps. xxviii. 4, lxi. 12, etc.), but is adopted by the very angels of God (Rev. xviii. 6). On this point an immense amount of needless difficulty has been raised by confounding the utterance of selfish malignity and revenge with the solemn reference of wrong-doing to the judgment of the God of truth.

⁶⁶ Acts xix. 38. Considering the commonness of the name, it is impossible to affirm with certainty that the Alexander of the *Acts* and of *I.* and *II. Timothy* was one and the same person; but there can be little doubt of his identity in the two latter passages, especially from the phrase "he hath greatly withstood our words."

⁶⁷ 1 Tim. i. 20.

⁶⁸ 2 Tim. ii. 15.

⁶⁹ 2 Tim. iv. 13. *φελόνη*, which means either a *cloak* or *case*, seems here to be the case that held the books so valued by the Apostle. It

Miletus, where he left Trophimus sick; and at *Corinth*, where Erastus stayed behind;” whether these refer severally to the journey by which he reached Ephesus, or to his voyage thence to Rome as a prisoner. It seems natural that this voyage should have been by way of Corinth and across the Isthmus, as the shortest route, and its commencement might have been either from Ephesus itself, or from Miletus, or from Troas, as the ship happened to be sailing.”

§ 11. If we are right in referring these allusions to recent events, it will follow that no long interval elapsed from Paul’s arrival at Rome to his writing the Epistle. We have one mark of its date in the fact that there was time left, after its transmission to Ephesus, for Timothy to make the journey thence and reach Rome *before winter*, by using diligence.” Meanwhile, accused no longer merely about questions of the law, but as a common malefactor (for so the Christians were regarded in the Neronian persecution)—with no Julius to recommend and no Burrus to protect him—Paul’s state may be inferred from the words, feebly rendered in our version, “wherein I *suffer trouble*, as an *evil-doer* (or felon), even unto bonds”⁹³—bonds more like those at Philippi than his former chain at Rome. But even now, as well as then, he could add, “but the word of God is not bound;”⁹⁴ and the converts, whose names appear for the first time in this Epistle—Eubulus, Pudens, Linus, and Claudia—derive a special lustre from their profession being made amid such dangers, and from its contrast to the falling away of older friends.” The Apostle

has been ingeniously conjectured that these were the Scriptures, and that the “parchments” so specially desired were some of the recent writings, now included in the New Testament. It may be observed what peculiar stress the Apostle lays, in the Epistle to Timothy, on the reading of the Holy Scriptures, “which are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus” (1 Tim. iv. 13, 2 Tim. iii. 14-17).

⁹⁰ 2 Tim. iv. 20.

⁹¹ Mr. Lewin supposes that Paul, after spending the winter of A.D. 64-65 at Nicopolis, traveled by way of Macedonia and Troas to Ephesus, and was arrested there toward the end of the year; and that he sailed from Ephesus, touching at Miletus,

to Corinth, crossing the Isthmus, which was the usual *winter* route from Asia to Italy. Thus he would arrive at Rome early in A.D. 66.

⁹² 2 Tim. iv. 9, 21.

⁹³ 2 Tim. ii. 9, ἐν ᾧ κακοπαθῶ μέχρι δεσμῶν ὡς κακοῦργος. This is confirmed by the repeated allusions to the element of *shame* in his sufferings (2 Tim. i. 8, 12, 16).

⁹⁴ 2 Tim. ii. 9: comp. Acts xxviii. 31, Eph. vi. 19, 20.

⁹⁵ 2 Tim. iv. 21. The names of Claudia and Pudens have given rise to conjectures peculiarly interesting to Christians of our own land. There is reason for supposing that this Claudia was a British maiden, daughter of King Cogidubnus, an ally of Rome (Tacit. *Agricol.* 14), who took the name of his imperial patron, Ti-

seems gratefully to acknowledge that his apparently certain fate had been postponed by God's special providence, expressly to give him new opportunities of proclaiming the Gospel."⁶⁶

In so simple a case as Paul's must now have seemed, there would be no reason to delay his trial, which might seem indeed a mere form, when Rome rang with the cry *Christianos ad leones*. But still the forms of Roman justice gave the innocent some shelter. We may assume that Paul established his right as a Roman citizen to be heard in his own defense;⁶⁷ and, as this is called his *first*, it would seem that his case was regulated by Nero's rule, of giving a separate hearing to each count in the indictment. In spite of the virulence of his accusers, probably including Alexander⁶⁸—perhaps even because they overreached themselves—either this count broke down or the hearing was adjourned. The Apostle's own account of the trial is poured out from the fullness of his heart, in terms

berius Claudius. She appears to have become the wife of Pudens, who is mentioned in the same verse. (See Martial, lib. iv. Epigr. 18.) This Pudens, we gather from an inscription found at Chichester, and now in the gardens at Goodwood, was at one time in close connection with King Cogidubnus, and gave an area for a temple of Neptune and Minerva, which was built by that king's authority. And Claudia is said in Martial (xi. 53) to have been *cæruleis Britannis edita*. Moreover, she is there also called *Rufina*. Now Pomponia, wife of the late commander in Britain, Aulus Plautius, under whom Claudia's father was received into alliance, belonged to a house of which the Rufi were one of the chief branches. If she herself were a Rufa, and Claudia her *protégée*, the latter might well be called *Rufina*; and we know that Pomponia was tried as *superstitionis externæ rea* in the year 57, Tacit. Ann. xii. 32; so that there are many circumstances concurrent, tending to give verisimilitude to the conjecture. See Archdeacon Williams's pamphlet "On Pudens and Claudia;" an article in the *Quarterly Review* for July, 1858, entitled "The Romans at Colchester;" and an Excursus in Alford's Greek Testament, vol. iii. Prolegg. p. 104,

in which the contents of the two works first mentioned are embodied in a summary form.

⁶⁶ 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17. The whole connection of this passage makes it impossible to explain the *πρώτη ἀπολογία* of Paul's former acquittal at Rome; and ver. 17, which has been applied to his evangelic labors in the interval, clearly means that he had been so strengthened to speak out the truth upon his trial, as to make a deep impression on all who heard him, a last appearance in court well worthy of the Apostle, as the word *πληροφορηθῇ* itself implies.

⁶⁷ Ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ μου ἀπολογίᾳ, 2 Tim. iv. 16.

⁶⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 15. The words *λίαν γὰρ ἀνθέστηκε τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις*, though they may only denote opposition to Paul's teaching at Ephesus, may just as well refer to vehement contention against him on his trial. Indeed, if we rightly infer from verse 14 that the charge was made by Alexander, it follows, according to the rules of procedure, that he sustained it in person at Rome. He had perhaps returned to Ephesus, when Paul wrote, to collect further evidence, and, as Paul had reason to believe, with the design of preferring a charge against Timothy (ver. 15).

less calculated to gratify the curious than to impress the devout. "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all forsook me—may it not be reckoned to them! But the Lord stood by me, and strengthened me, that through me the preaching might be accomplished and all the Gentiles might hear: *and I was delivered from the mouth of the lion.*"⁹⁹ Is this merely a proverbial expression? Or does it refer to the lions of the amphitheatre? or to the mighty monster, who now well deserved to be described by the same figure which Peter applies to the arch-enemy, and which is often used in Scripture for fierce and malignant foes.¹⁰⁰ The sense of fitness might well make us content with the last interpretation; but that there hangs upon it the other question, whether Paul was heard by Nero in person. If the affirmative be chosen, this first trial must have taken place before Nero's departure for Greece in the spring of A.D. 66, which seems the earliest date that can be assigned to it. Then comes the question, what interval is to be allowed between this first trial and the Apostle's martyrdom? For this we have no decisive data. While the tone of the Epistle denotes Paul's certain expectation of the issue, his urgency for Timothy to come before winter implies the probability of considerable delay. It must be left undecided whether Nero passed sentence on the Apostle before departing for Greece, or whether Paul received the martyr's crown while that of Olympia was bestowed by flattery on the prince; and whether he was executed with or without another trial.¹⁰¹

§ 12. The interval, whether longer or shorter, exhibits the Apostle to us in one of the most interesting aspects of his life, as "a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Christ to life everlasting." Deeply feeling, as we have seen, the pain and indignity of his bonds, he was still more deeply tried by a sense of loneliness. Crescens and Titus had been sent on missions to Galatia and Dalmatia; Tychicus was the bearer of the Epistle to Timothy; and, when there remained with him only Luke and Demas, the latter forsook him, "having loved the present world," and departed for Thessalonica.¹⁰² But there was another who had repented of his for-

⁹⁹ 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17.

¹⁰⁰ 1 Pet. v. 8: comp. Ps. vii. 2, xxii. 21, lvii. 4.

¹⁰¹ If we adopt the traditional date of June 29th, and also the tradition that Paul suffered under Nero, the date of A.D. 68 is clearly too late; since Nero's

own death took place on June 9th of that year. ¹⁰² 2 Tim. iv. 9-11.

"Look in, and see Christ's chosen saint
In triumph wear his Christ-like chain;
No fear lest he should swerve or faint;
'His life is Christ, his death is gain.'"

• Phil. i. 21.

mer desertion ; and Paul now desires the ministry of Mark,¹⁰³ while he looks to Timothy above all for his remaining comfort upon earth.

There seems to be a deeper meaning than has usually been observed in these repeated and urgent invitations to Timothy. If any one should be tempted to discover an element of selfishness in the willingness of Paul to expose so attached a friend to the dangers of Rome, we will not say merely that the peril was probably equally great at Ephesus—especially from the machinations of Alexander—but that Paul seems to invite Timothy to Rome expressly to confront its dangers. "His own son in the faith" had not only to render the last ministrations to a father, and to receive that father's last counsels ; but to see him "finish his course with joy," that he might "arm himself with the like mind." There comes to all a time when the chief work of life is to prepare for death ; and it seems most probable that Timothy would not long survive the blow aimed at Paul, or at least that he would be in constant danger of martyrdom from a popular tumult or a new outbreak of persecution.¹⁰⁴ An attentive reader will observe how closely the admonitions to make full proof of his ministry are connected with exhortations to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ ; and how the glorious principles which sustained the Apostle in the

"Two converts, watching by his side,
Alike his love and greetings share ;
LUKE, the beloved, the sick soul's guide,
And DEMAS, named in falt'ring prayer."

"Pass a few years—look in once more—
The saint is in his bonds again ;
Save that his hopes more boldly soar,
He and his lot unchanged remain.

"But *only Luke* is with him now :—
Alas, that even the martyr's cell,
Heaven's very gate, should scope allow
For the false world's seducing spell."
CHRISTIAN YEAR. *St. Luke.*

¹⁰³ 2 Tim. iv. 11.

¹⁰⁴ The fact itself is involved in the general obscurity of the post-apostolic age. The theory which finds in Heb. xiii. 23 an indication that Timothy shared St. Paul's last imprisonment, and was released from it by the death of Nero, is quite inadmissible on our view of the authorship and date of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him continue to act as bishop of Ephesus,

till he died a martyr's death under Domitian or Nerva. He protested, it is said, against the license and frenzy of the festival of Artemis ; and the infuriated mob put him to death with clubs (Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 14 ; Niceph. *H. E.* iii. 11). But, besides the little dependence to be placed on these accounts, the story comes into collision, not only with the traditions about St. John's relations to the Church of Ephesus, but with the evidence of the Apocalypse itself. That Timothy should have remained bishop of the Church at Ephesus without any allusion to his name in the Epistle to that Church (to say nothing of John's General Epistle) seems almost as incredible as the wild hypothesis that he was the "angel of the Church of Ephesus," who shares John's reproof to the Church for leaving their first love (Rev. ii. 1). Comp. chap. xx. § 20.

prospect of martyrdom are stated for the very purpose of fortifying the disciple. "Be not thou ashamed of the testimony (τὸ μαρτύριον) of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner; but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the Gospel, according to the power of God." "If we be dead with him we shall also live with him: if we suffer, we shall also reign with him: if we deny him, he also will deny us." Such are the last counsels of the spiritual father to the son whom he desired to be his follower in all things, even to the martyr's death, that so he might share with him the martyr's crown.

And how these principles sustained the Apostle's own mind, and put the climax to the moral grandeur and spiritual glory of his career, can be told in no words except his own. The contrast is indeed striking between the Epistles written during his former imprisonment and this last letter to Timothy. Then, even while brought face to face with death, and desiring it as gain, he looks back to the world, in which he had yet much to do for Christ; and he feels too that his own spiritual life is not yet perfect:—"Brethren, *I count not myself to have apprehended*; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forward unto those things that are before, *I press toward the mark* for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."¹⁰⁶ But now his work is done; the last tie of service that bound him to the world is severed; the goal to which he had pressed forward is within his reach:—"I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought the good fight,¹⁰⁶ I HAVE FINISHED MY COURSE, I have kept the faith. For the rest, there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous judge shall give me at that day: and not to me only, *but unto all them also that love his appearing*."¹⁰⁷ The last words put the finishing stroke to the Apostle's course: he ends, as he began, "a pattern for them that should hereafter believe on Christ." We may well be content, though our curiosity about the precise time and manner of his departure remain unsatisfied, when we have this last view of him in his own writings:—"The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly kingdom: to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen."¹⁰⁸

§ 13. We have the concurrent testimony of ecclesiastical

¹⁰⁶ Phil. iii. 13, 14.

¹⁰⁶ More exactly, *I have completed the glorious contest*, τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν ἡγωνισμαί, one of Paul's well-

known metaphors from the Grecian games.

¹⁰⁷ 2 Tim. iv. 6-8.

¹⁰⁸ 2 Tim. iv. 18.

antiquity, that St. Paul was beheaded at Rome during the Neronian persecution. The earliest allusion to his death is in the same passage of Clemens Romanus which has been quoted as the authority for his journey to the West:—"Having gone to the boundary of the West, and borne witness before the governors, he was thus released from the world."¹⁰⁹ The next authorities are those quoted in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, the contemporary of Constantine the Great;¹¹⁰—Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 180), says that Peter and Paul went to Italy, and taught there together, and suffered martyrdom about the same time:—Caius, a learned presbyter of Rome, supposed to be writing within the 2d century, names the grave of St. Peter on the Vatican, and that of St. Paul on the road to Ostia. Eusebius himself entirely adopts the tradition that St. Paul was beheaded under Nero at Rome. The next testimony in importance is that of Tertullian (early in the 3d century), who says that at Rome "Peter was conformed to the passion of the Lord; Paul was crowned with the death of John the Baptist."¹¹¹ The Martyrdom of the Apostles Peter and Paul, under Nero at Rome, is mentioned in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, which is the earliest authority for the *date*. The twofold event is placed under the year 2083 from the birth of Abraham, Olymp. 211.4, and the 13th year of Nero, data which, though not free from difficulties of interpretation, point to A.D. 67.¹¹² Jerome (about A.D. 480) places the event in the 14th of Nero; but he probably means the 13th, being misled by an error in the *Chronicle*, which he translated: he also specifies the mode

¹⁰⁹ Ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου.

¹¹⁰ *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 25.

¹¹¹ *De Præscript. Hæret.* 36. "Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, Paulus Johannis exitu coronatur."

¹¹² *Euseb. Chron. Arm.* The *Chronicon* of Eusebius (the Greek text of which is lost) exists in two forms; the Latin version of St. Jerome, and the Armenian Version which was discovered at Constantinople, and published in 1818. The era adopted by Eusebius is the *Birth of Abraham*, which he places in B.C. 2016, *reckoning his years from the autumnal equinox*. Side by side with these years are placed the *Olympiads*, the *Era* of which is *Midsummer* B.C. 776. This

difference of a quarter of a year between the two eras is dealt with in two different ways in the two Versions. Both make the beginning of each Olympic year coincide with an Abrahamic year; but Jerome marks the Olympic year at the Eusebian year *in which it began*, the Armenian at that *in which it ended*: the former begins the Olympic year a quarter too late; the latter anticipates the next Olympic year by three-quarters of a year: and the Olympiads of the Armenian are always a year behind those of Jerome. Clinton considers that the notation of Jerome is that of Eusebius. The following Table exhibits the correspondence for the four years over which the present question ranges:—

and place of St. Paul's death and burial.¹¹³ The anonymous author of the "Martyrdom of St. Paul" states that he was beheaded under Nero, on June 29th,¹¹⁴ in the 36th year from the Passion of the Saviour, 330 years before the time at which he himself wrote, which was in the 4th consulship of Honorius and the 3d consulship of Arcadius, A.D. 396, which would bring us to A.D. 66; and this agrees with Epiphanius, who places it in the 12th of Nero. The choice seems to lie between 66 and 67: Mr. Lewin adopts the former. The mode of St. Paul's death, by simple beheading (without scourging), which was the military form of execution at this time,¹¹⁵ was doubtless the last privilege of his citizenship. Like his Master, he suffered "without the gate," on the busy road leading to the port of Ostia; probably under the shadow of the sepulchral pyramid of Caius Cestius, which now overhangs the Protestant cemetery.¹¹⁶

| B.O. | Qr. | Begin-
ning. | Ann. Neron. | Euseb.
Ann. Ab. | Hieron.
Olymp. | Arm.
Olymp. | Olymp.
(true.) | A.U.C. |
|------|-----|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------|
| 65 | 1. | Jan. 1 | XII. from Oct. 13 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 818 |
| | 2. | Apr. 1 | | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| | 3. | July 1 | | .. | .. | .. | 211.1 | .. |
| | 4. | Oct. 1 | | 2081 | 211.1 | 211.2 | .. | .. |
| 66 | 1. | Jan. 1 | XIII. " Oct. 13 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 819 |
| | 2. | Apr. 1 | | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| | 3. | July 1 | | .. | .. | .. | 211.2 | .. |
| | 4. | Oct. 1 | | 2082 | 211.2 | 211.3 | .. | .. |
| 67 | 1. | Jan. 1 | XIV. " Oct. 13 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 820 |
| | 2. | Apr. 1 | | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| | 3. | July 1 | | .. | .. | .. | 211.3 | .. |
| | 4. | Oct. 1 | | 2083 | 211.3 | 211.4 | .. | .. |
| 68 | 1. | Jan. 1 | Ob. June 9 | .. | .. | .. | .. | 821 |
| | 2. | Apr. 1 | | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. |
| | 3. | July 1 | | .. | .. | .. | 211.4 | .. |
| | 4. | Oct. 1 | | 2084 | 211.4 | 212.1 | .. | .. |

The apparent discrepancy still left between this Table and the statement quoted in the text is explained by the fact that Eusebius places the accession of Nero one year too late; and we must either alter his "13th of Nero" into the 14th, or deduct one from his other figures. The latter is preferable, as the traditional date of June 29th, in the 14th of Nero (B.C. 68), would place the martyrdom after Nero's death.

¹¹³ *Catal. Script.* art. "Paulus:" "Hic igitur xiv^o Neronis anno (eodem die quo Petrus) Romæ pro Christo capite truncatus sepultusque est in viâ Ostiensi" As to the

error of a year, see the preceding note.

¹¹⁴ This day, from the tradition preserved by Jerome, that the two Apostles suffered at the same time, is marked in the ecclesiastical calendar as St. Peter's.

¹¹⁵ See Conybeare and Howson, ii. 596, note 4.

¹¹⁶ See the reflections on this coincidence in Conybeare and Howson, ii. 597. As to the *place* of St. Paul's execution, Dr. Howson observes that it was not uncommon to send prisoners, whose death might attract too much notice at Rome, to some distance from the city, under a military

§ 14. *Personal Appearance and Character of St. Paul.*—We have no very trustworthy sources of information as to the personal appearance of St. Paul. Those which we have are referred to and quoted in Conybeare and Howson.¹¹⁷ They are the early pictures and mosaics described by Mrs. Jameson, and passages from Malalas, Nicephorus, and the apocryphal *Acta Pauli et Theclæ*.¹¹⁸ They all agree in ascribing to the Apostle a short stature, a long face with high forehead, an aquiline nose, close and prominent eyebrows. Other characteristics mentioned are baldness, grey eyes, a clear complexion, and a winning expression. Of his temperament and character St. Paul is himself the best painter. His speeches and letters convey to us, as we read them, the truest impressions of those qualities which helped to make him The Great Apostle. We perceive the warmth and ardor of his nature, his deeply affectionate disposition, the tenderness of his sense of honor, the courtesy and personal dignity of his bearing, his perfect fearlessness, his heroic endurance; we perceive the rare combination of subtlety, tenacity, and versatility in his intellect; we perceive also a practical wisdom which we should have associated with a cooler temperament, and a tolerance which is seldom united with such impetuous convictions. And the principle which harmonized all these endowments and directed them to a practical end was, beyond dispute, a knowledge of Jesus Christ in the Divine Spirit. Personal allegiance to Christ as to a living Master, with a growing insight into the relation of Christ to each man and to the world, carried the Apostle forward on a straight course through every vicissitude of personal fortunes and amid the various habits of thought which he had to encounter. The conviction that he had been entrusted with a Gospel concerning a Lord and Deliverer of men was what sustained him and purified his love for his own people, while it created in him such a love for mankind that he only knew himself as a servant of others for Christ's sake.

It would also be beyond the scope of this book to attempt to exhibit the traces of St. Paul's Apostolic work in the history of the Church. But there is one indication, so excep-

escort, for execution. Wieseler compares the execution of Calpurnius Galerianus at the 40th mile-stone from the city on the Appian Way (Tac. *Hist.* iv. 11, A.D. 70). The great basilica of St. Paul now stands outside the walls of Rome, on the road to Ostia, in commemoration of his

martyrdom, and the *Porta Ostiensis* (in the present Aurelian wall) is called the *Gate of St. Paul*. The traditional spot of the martyrdom is the *tre fontane*, not far from the Basilica.

¹¹⁷ Vol. i. ch. vii. end.

¹¹⁸ Conybeare and Howson, i. 197

tional as to deserve special mention, which shows that the difficulty of understanding the Gospel of St. Paul, and of reconciling it with a true Judaism, was very early felt. This is in the apocryphal work called the Clementines (*τὰ Κλημέντια*), supposed to be written before the end of the 2d century. These curious compositions contain direct assaults (for though the name is not given, the references are plain and undisguised) upon the authority and the character of St. Paul. St. Peter is represented as the true Apostle of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, and St. Paul is *ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος*, who opposes St. Peter and St. James. The portions of the Clementines which illustrate the writer's view of St. Paul will be found in Stanley's *Corinthians*; ¹¹⁹ and an account of the whole work, with references to the treatises of Schliemann and Baur, in Gieseler. ¹²⁰

§ 15. In direct contradiction to these malicious figments, the latest evidence of Scripture and the testimony of the early Church exhibit the two chief Apostles as true fellow-laborers in the work for their common Lord, and "in their death not divided." Their harmonious working had been thoroughly established by the celebrated agreement made at Jerusalem, that the one should go to the Jews and the other to the Gentiles; ¹²¹ nor was it interrupted even by that painful collision at Antioch, when Peter submitted to Paul's reproof for his weak compliance with the Judaizers. ¹²² From that time to his death, all that we learn of St. Peter in the New Testament is the little that can be inferred from his own Epistles. Indeed the consecutive history of his part in the foundation of Christianity ceases with his miraculous deliverance from the prison where he lay condemned to death by Herod Agrippa. ¹²³

The special work assigned to him by the symbol of the *keys* was now completed. He had founded the Church, *opened the gates* to Jews and Gentiles, and distinctly laid down the conditions of admission. Almost direct from his prison door he left Jerusalem, but we are not told whither he went: certainly not to Rome, where there are no traces of his presence before the last years of his life. He probably remained in Judæa, visiting and confirming the Churches: some old

¹¹⁹ Introd. to 2 Cor.

¹²⁰ *Eccl. Hist.* i. § 58. These remarks are from the article PAUL, by the Rev. Llewellyn Davies, in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, the most im-

portant parts of which have been incorporated with the chapters of this work relating to St. Paul.

¹²¹ See chap. xv., § 17.

¹²² See chap. xv., § 20.

¹²³ See chap. xv., § 4.

but not trustworthy traditions represent him as preaching in Cæsarea and other cities on the western coast of Palestine. He makes one more appearance in the *Acts* at the "Council of Jerusalem," where he took the lead in the discussion, urging the great principle, established by the case of Cornelius, that purifying faith and saving grace remove all distinction between believers. His arguments, adopted and enforced by James, decided that question at once and forever. But he exercised, on this occasion, none of the powers which Romanists hold to be inalienably attached to the chair of St. Peter. He did not preside at the meeting, he neither summoned nor dismissed it; he neither collected the suffrages nor pronounced the decision. He retained that personal but unofficial priority which had been assigned to him by Christ; but the government of the Church of Jerusalem was in the hands of James.¹²⁴

The silence of the Scripture narrative concerning Peter, from this point onward, is a direct consequence of the plan of the *Acts of the Apostles*. As each step in the spread of the Gospel is completed, the agent—Peter, John, or Philip—recedes from view, just as Paul himself does after his last testimony to the Jews at Rome. The two great movements by which Christianity was launched among the Jews and the Gentiles being fairly started, the detailed progress of the work is not pursued, and hence it follows that the acts of the other Apostles find no place in the history. Peter was probably employed, for the most part, in building up and completing the organization of the Churches in Palestine and the adjoining districts. Beyond these limits, his name is associated by ecclesiastical tradition with the Churches of Corinth, Antioch, and Rome, but with no others.¹²⁵ The evidence of his having been at Corinth between St. Paul's first labors there and the writing of the *First Epistle to the Corinthians* is very strong;¹²⁶ but the reference to parties who claimed

¹²⁴ Accordingly St. Paul names James before Cephas and John in his account of the conference which probably took place at this time (Gal. ii. 9).

¹²⁵ The Church of Alexandria is supposed to have been founded by St. Mark after Peter's death. It is an important fact, as bearing upon the Romish claim of supremacy in right of Peter, that St. Leo represents the relation of St. Peter to Antioch as precisely the same in which he stood to Rome (*Epist.* 92).

¹²⁶ The following are the chief points of evidence:—(1.) The allusions to Peter in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. (2.) Inferences drawn from the statements of Clements Romanus (*Epist. I. ad Corinth.* c. 4). (3.) The positive assertion of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth (A.D. 180 at the latest), a man of excellent judgment, who was not likely to be misinformed, nor to make such an assertion lightly in an epistle addressed to the Bishop and Church of Rome.

Peter, Apollos, Paul, and even Christ, as their chiefs, involves no opposition between the Apostles themselves, such as the fabulous Clementines and modern infidelity assume.

§ 16. Next comes the evidence furnished by the *First Epistle of Peter*, which is addressed “to the elect sojourners of the Dispersion”¹²⁷ of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,” that is, the whole of Asia Minor, except some of the central parts, and the sea-board south of the Taurus. Whether Peter himself actually visited these countries is very doubtful, from the absence of any personal reminiscences and salutations in the Epistle. But there is one word which fixes the place from which the Epistle was written, if at least we take that word in its literal significance:—“The Church that is at BABYLON, elected together with you, saluteth you.”¹²⁸ If we suppose that Peter was visiting his Jewish brethren of the Eastern Dispersion, there is no place which he would be more likely to make the goal and head-quarters of such a tour. Babylon was at that time, and for some hundreds of years afterward, a chief seat of Jewish culture. Under the tolerant rule of the Parthians, the Jewish families there formed a separate and wealthy community; and thence they had spread to many of the districts of Asia Minor to which the Epistle was addressed. Their intercourse with Judæa was uninterrupted; and their language, probably a mixture of Hebrew and Nabatean, must have borne a near affinity to the Galilean dialect. Christianity certainly made considerable progress at an early time in that and the adjoining districts; and the prevailing *Petrine* tone of the great Christian schools at Edessa and Nisibis is supposed by some to indicate the Apostle as their founder.

¹²⁷ 1 Pet. i. 1. ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς. It is the almost universal opinion of ancient and modern commentators, that the Epistle was written to Hebrew converts; but several passages are evidently addressed to the Gentile members of the same churches; as 1 Pet. 14, 18, ii. 9, 10.

¹²⁸ 1 Pet. v. 13: Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή: there can be no doubt that ἐκκλησία is the word to be understood, though some commentators have fancifully taken it to mean Peter's wife (comp. ἐκλεκτῇ in 2 John i., where some again suppose a church to be meant). Origen (ap.

Euseb. iii. 1), who is followed by Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxvii.) and Jerome (*Catal.* c. 1.), seems merely to have drawn the inference from the Epistle itself—κεκηρυγμέναι εἶπεν. The almost unanimous opinion of the ancient commentators, that Rome—the mystical Babylon—is meant, has been adopted and maintained with great ingenuity, and some very strong arguments by Schaff, Neander, Steiger, De Wette, and Wieseler. Besides, however, the presumption in favor of the literal sense, there is the almost certain fact, that the Apocalypse was not yet written.

§ 17. But a more important indication than that of place is found in the names of the *persons* who were with Peter when he wrote this Epistle, *Silvanus* and *Mark*.¹²⁹ The close connection of both with Paul furnishes evidence of intercourse between the two Apostles, though severed by the distance between the capitals of the Eastern and Western world. Of *SILVANUS* we have lost sight, since we saw him as the companion of St. Paul's second missionary journey; and there is nothing to show how he came to be in Peter's company. The case of *MARK* is clearer; for he was with Paul in his first imprisonment at Rome, and he was then contemplating a journey to Asia Minor.¹³⁰ This intention was no doubt fulfilled, since we find him afterward with Timothy at Ephesus.¹³¹ The interval is just the time at which all indications concur to place Peter's First Epistle, and consequently Mark's companionship with him;¹³² and the inference is highly probable, that Mark was the bearer of communications from Paul to Peter. The hypothesis that Silvanus also had been sent by Paul from Rome to visit the Asiatic churches, of which he had been the joint founder, and so had gone on to join Peter at Babylon, seems inconsistent with the absence of his name from the Acts and the Pauline Epistles subsequent to the second circuit. Others think that he visited the Asiatic churches in his character as one of the leaders of the Church of Jerusalem,¹³³ and then joined Peter at Babylon.

Be this as it may, the fact is deeply significant, that, when Peter wrote this Epistle to the Hebrew Christians of the Eastern Dispersion, two of Paul's companions were his intimate associates, and one of them the bearer of the Epistle which its writer intended as a manifesto of the true doctrine of the grace of God. "By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you, as I account him, I have written briefly, exhorting and testifying that *this is the true grace of God* wherein ye stand."¹³⁴

¹²⁹ 1 Pet. v. 12, 13.

¹³⁰ Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24.

¹³¹ 2 Tim. iv. 11.

¹³² Concerning Mark's connection with Peter, and the writing of his Gospel under the Apostle's supervision, see further in the supplemental chapter on the Apostles and Evangelists.

¹³³ Acts xv. 22. In this character Silas must have been well known to Peter, even before his intimacy with Paul: a fact which seems to negative the inference sometimes drawn from

the words, *ὡς λογίζομαι* (1 Pet. v. 12: "as I suppose," A.V.), which seem to be really an emphatic form of commendation, "*I account him* a faithful brother to you; do you confide in him as he deserves." These words, however, go far to support the idea that Silas, as the representative of Pauline teaching, had met with some of that opposition from the Jewish churches of the Dispersion, which it was one object of the Epistle to correct.

¹³⁴ 1 Pet. v. 12.

This distinctly Pauline phrase¹³⁵ sums up what has been called the Pauline element running throughout the whole Epistle; and, though the epithet jars upon the ear—as if it could be supposed that the Apostles taught different versions of the one Gospel—the Epistle may well be designated as *Peter's testimony to the truth of the Gospel taught by Paul*.

This object, which Peter distinctly affirms in the Second Epistle,¹³⁶ may be traced as clearly in the First as if Paul had been named in both; and it is a glorious exhibition of the unity of Christian doctrine that, while the Apostle of the Gentiles is doing battle with the Judaizers, the Apostle of the Jews cuts them off from their favorite appeal from Paul to his superior authority. This character is plainly seen both in the general teaching of the Epistle and in particular points of style and phraseology. Sometimes, indeed, we might fancy the positions of the two Apostles interchanged. The Apostle of the circumcision says not a word of the perpetual obligation, the dignity, or even the bearings, of the Mosaic Law. There are, in fact, more traces of what may, in one sense, be called Judaizing views, more of sympathy with national hopes, not to say prejudices, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, than is this of Peter. This is a point of great importance, as showing how utterly opposed was the teaching of the original Apostles, whom St. Peter certainly represents, to that Judaistic narrowness which speculative rationalism has imputed to all the early followers of Christ, with the exception of St. Paul.

§ 18. The resemblances of style and expression present a curious problem, to which Peter himself has given us the key. "Even as our beloved brother Paul, *according to the wisdom given unto him* hath written unto you; as also in *all his Epistles*, speaking in them of these things; in which are *some things hard to be understood*, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, *as also the other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction."¹³⁷ This celebrated passage, the very key-stone

¹³⁵ Besides many other passages, see especially Acts xx. 24; 1 Corinthians xv. 1.

¹³⁶ 2 Peter iii. 15.

¹³⁷ 2 Peter iii. 15, 16. The specific doctrine here quoted from St. Paul—that "the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation"—is found in the *Epistle to the Romans* (ii. 4): an interesting confirmation of what is implied in the context, that all Paul's

Epistles were in general circulation throughout the churches, and, with the other books of the New Testament that were already written (included, like the Epistles, in the phrase *the other Scriptures*), were regarded as parts of Holy Scripture. So early do we trace the formation of the *New Testament Canon* by a progress of vital growth, not of arbitrary selection.

of apostolic evidence to the divine authority of *all* St. Paul's Epistles, and by inference of *the other Scriptures* of the New Testament as well as of the Old—gives at the same time the clearest exhibition of an Apostle applying his ordinary human intelligence to the study of those Scriptures. The “unlettered layman”¹³⁸ of Galilee, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, admired deeply the *wisdom* granted to Paul, while, by the spiritual discernment given to himself, he grappled with the difficulties of his arguments. But we may be sure that this was not accomplished, even by Peter, without that careful *reading*, “whereby,” Paul himself had written, “ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ.”¹³⁹ What a suggestive picture: *Peter perusing Paul's Epistles!* Such an attentive study, perused with an anxiety to clear up the doubts at which the unlearned and unstable might stumble, could not but leave its mark on Peter's style.

Nor can we think that he would despise the aid of Paul's companion, the Hellenist Silvanus, whose name was joined with Paul's in the superscription of some of these very Epistles,¹⁴⁰ and in the declaration of the Gospel taught by the Apostle.¹⁴¹ The mere words “by Silvanus I have written to you” refer, according to usage, to the bearer rather than the writer or amanuensis of the Epistle; but they may include the latter meaning. At all events, it is highly probable that Silvanus, considering his rank, character, and special connection with those churches, and with their great Apostle and founder, would be consulted by St. Peter throughout, and that they would read together the Epistles of St. Paul, especially those to the Asiatic churches. Thus a Pauline coloring may have been introduced into the Epistle partly unconsciously, but in some passages amounting to a studied imitation of St. Paul's representations of Christian truth. The early writers inform us that Peter employed interpreters;¹⁴² nor is there any thing inconsistent with his position and character in the supposition that Silvanus, perhaps also Mark, may have

¹³⁸ Acts iv. 13, ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται seems to mean ignorant of rabbinical lore.

¹³⁹ Eph. iii. 4, δύνασθε ἀναγινώσκοντες νοῆσαι. Observe the verbal connection with the δυνόματα of St. Peter.

¹⁴⁰ 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1.

¹⁴¹ 2 Cor. i. 19.

¹⁴² Basilides, an early Gnostic, professed to derive his system from

Glaucias, one of these interpreters. This shows at least the impression that the Apostle did not understand Greek, or did not speak it with fluency. Connected with this view is the explanation of the differences of style between Peter's First and Second Epistles by supposing that he was aided in the former chiefly by the Hellenist Silas, in the latter by the Hebrew Mark.

assisted him in giving expression to the thoughts suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. We have thus, at any rate, a not unsatisfactory solution of the difficulty arising from correspondences, both of style and modes of thought, in the writings of two Apostles who differed so widely in gifts and acquirements.¹⁴³ For the rest, the objects of the Epistle are, to comfort and strengthen the Christians in a season of severe trial; to enforce the practical and spiritual duties involved in their calling; and to warn them against the special temptations attached to their position.¹⁴⁴

§ 19. The whole tone of St. Peter's First Epistle is that of a man advanced in life and approaching the end of his career. Thus far, then, we have no evidence in the New Testament to connect the Apostle in any way with Rome; but we have, on the other hand, strong negative evidence in the absence of any allusion to St. Peter in the Epistle to the Romans. Whence, then, arose that tradition of St. Peter's episcopate at Rome, on which the Papacy—parodying our Lord's great prophecy of the Rock—has founded the claims that long transformed European Christianity into a system of worldly power and ambition? The only positive evidence worth notice is a statement of Eusebius, so obviously erroneous as to be void of all authority. He makes St. Peter visit Rome in A.D. 42, and remain there twenty years.¹⁴⁵ Now it can be shown that the date rests on a miscalculation; and the duration of the visit is altogether inconsistent with the notices in the *Acts* of Peter's presence at Jerusalem and Antioch.

We might almost say that the sole color of probability has been given to the Romish assumption by the uneasy anxiety of some Protestants to reject the one fact that is supported by a mass of evidence, the martyrdom of St. Peter at Rome about the same time as St. Paul. That Peter was appointed,

¹⁴³ The most striking resemblances are perhaps 1 Pet. i. 3 with Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 18 with Eph. vi. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 1 with Eph. v. 22; 1 Pet. v. 5 with Eph. v. 21: but there are almost equally distinct parallels to passages in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Colossians, Thessalonians, and Philemon.

¹⁴⁴ The important questions connected with the *Second Epistle of Peter* are reserved for the Appendix on the Books of the New Testament.

¹⁴⁵ Euseb. *Chron. Arm. s. a.* Jerome (*Catal. c. 1*) follows Eusebius,

but extends the time to twenty-five years. The attempts of Romanists to show the bare possibility of these statements are so contradictory as to refute one another. The most ingenious is that of Windischman, who assumes that Peter went to Rome immediately after his deliverance from prison in A.D. 44 (*Acts xii.*), and that he left in consequence of the Claudian persecution, between A.D. 49 and 51. To so gratuitous an assumption it is enough to reply, that it leaves no room for the length of time assigned by Eusebius.

by a higher will than that of Nero, to suffer death by crucifixion, is the unquestioned meaning of our Lord's celebrated prophecy.¹⁴⁶ Clement of Rome attests his martyrdom in a general connection with that of Paul.¹⁴⁷ A more detailed testimony, of very high antiquity, is that of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth (A.D. 180), that "Nero, the first who signally proclaimed himself an antagonist to God,"¹⁴⁸ was excited to the slaughter of the Apostles. They relate, then, that Paul was beheaded at Rome itself, and that Peter was likewise crucified."¹⁴⁹ Eusebius himself says elsewhere that "Peter was crucified at Rome, head downward, and Paul was beheaded."¹⁵⁰ The presbyter Caius (about A.D. 200) speaks of St. Peter's tomb on the Vatican; and we might add the testimonies of Origen, Tertullian, and, in a word, the universal consent of the early Fathers. As to the date, the oldest authorities merely say that the two Apostles suffered *about the same time*, and under Nero. The chronologists, as we have seen, fix their martyrdom to *the same year*, varying between the 12th, 13th, and 14th of Nero, that is between Oct. 13, A.D. 65, and June 9, A.D. 68. Jerome places both *on the same day*, which tradition makes the 29th of June. We can easily understand the desire to associate the two great Apostles as closely as possible in prison and in death; but such a connection seems to be excluded by the negative evidence of the Second Epistle to Timothy; though, otherwise, we might gladly trace it in Peter's last allusion to "our beloved brother Paul."¹⁵¹

There remains one point of considerable importance. Though, as we have seen, it is impossible to believe that Peter could have been at Rome till the last year or two of his life, the best authorities represent his martyrdom as preceded

¹⁴⁶ John xiii. 36, xxi. 18, 19.

¹⁴⁷ *Epist. I. ad. Cor. v.* 'Ο Πέτρος διὰ ζήλον ἀδικον οὐχ ἓνα οὐδὲ δύο, ἀλλὰ πλείονας ὑπὴνεγκεν πόνους, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρήσας ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον τῆς δόξης. The absence of any mention of the *place* of Peter's death is quite natural, as at that early period it would be well known.

¹⁴⁸ Θεομάχος.

¹⁴⁹ Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 25.

¹⁵⁰ Euseb. *Dem. Evang.* iii. 3. p. 116. Πέτρος δὲ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατὰ κεφαλῆς σταυροῦται. In this statement of the singular manner of Peter's execution we begin, perhaps, to trace the em-

bellishments of tradition. Origen (ap. Euseb. iii. 1) ascribes it to the choice of Peter, who deemed himself unworthy to be crucified in the same position as his Lord. We have many examples (for instance during the siege of Jerusalem) of the spirit of cruel mockery with which the Roman soldiers fastened their victims to the cross in all manner of strange attitudes. It is said that Peter's wife, after sharing his journeys and evangelic labors, was martyred shortly before him, and was supported in the hour of trial by her husband's exhortation.

¹⁵¹ 2 Pet. iii. 15.

by a period of labor in Italy. Thus Ignatius, one of the Apostolic Fathers, in his undoubtedly genuine Epistle to the Romans, speaks of St. Peter in terms which imply a special connection with their Church.¹⁵² Dionysius of Corinth, in the passage quoted above, is accounting for the intimate relations between the Churches of Corinth and Rome by the fact, which every body knew, that Peter and Paul both taught in Italy. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, who was a hearer of St. John, bears distinct witness to St. Peter's presence at Rome; and from the eminent position that he held in the West, as bishop of Lyon, as well as his constant intercourse with the East, he can hardly have been misinformed.¹⁵³ In short, the churches most nearly connected with that of Rome, and those least affected by its influence, which was as yet but inconsiderable in the East, concur in the statement that Peter was a joint founder of that Church and suffered death in that city.

But just in proportion to their belief in this fact, is the weight of their implicit denial of the assumption that Peter was the sole founder or resident head of that Church, or that the see of Rome derived from him any claim to supremacy. At the utmost, they place him on a footing of equality with St. Paul.¹⁵⁴ The figment of Peter's supremacy over the other Apostles, as the Rock on which the Church is built, resolves itself into the metaphor from his name which Romanists are never weary of misquoting; but we need go no further than Peter's own beautiful developement of the figure—which he amplifies as if conscious that his distinctive name bound him to bear testimony to the Chief Corner Stone—for a confirmation of the great truth proclaimed by Paul:—*“Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST.”*¹⁵⁵

§ 20. The “wise master-builders,” who placed the first

¹⁵² *Epist. ad Rom.* iv.

¹⁵³ *Adv. Hær.* iii. 1, 3.

¹⁵⁴ Cotelier has collected a large number of passages from the early Fathers, in which the name of Paul precedes that of Peter. Fabricius observes that this is the general usage of the Greek Fathers. It is also to be remarked that, when the Fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries—for instance, Chrysostom and Augustine—use the mere title *ὁ Ἀπόστολος* or *Apostolus*, they mean Paul, not Peter.

¹⁵⁵ 1 Pet. ii. 4-8: comp. 1 Cor. iii. 10-12; Eph. ii. 20, 21, etc. These and similar passages distinctly show the secondary senso in which the Apostles were said to lay, and themselves to be, the foundation of the Church—the *Apostles*—not any one of them—as is especially seen in St. John's vision of the New Jerusalem. “The wall of the city”—its outer bulwark—“had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the *twelve Apostles of the Lamb*” (Rev. xxi. 14).

“living stones” upon that “Rock of Ages”—like the massive substructions laid by Solomon upon the Rock of Zion—are now vanishing from the scene of their labors, at the very time when the newly-finished Temple—the type of that spiritual edifice—awaits its destruction from the Roman armies. The greater number of the Apostles have early disappeared to the uncertain scenes of their evangelic labors.¹⁵⁶ Of those who fill a prominent place in the Scripture history, JAMES the son of Zebedee has long since died by the sword of Herod,¹⁵⁷ and JAMES, the brother of our Lord, has lately fallen by the tumultuous judgment of the Sanhedrim.¹⁵⁸ JUDE’s voice alone is heard, concurring with Peter’s in denouncing the corruptions of the last times. During the years included within the range of doubt concerning the martyrdom of Paul and Peter (A.D. 66–68) the final revolt of the Jews has broken out; and an exterminating war only awaits its end in the destruction of the Temple. The death of the arch-persecutor suspends for two years the catastrophe by which the visible house of God is to make way for the spiritual edifice, which is now sufficiently completed to take its place. In that solemn interval some modern critics of high repute place the last inspired voice which was to complete the testimony of the Apostles and the canon of the Scriptures, and make the end of the work of St. Peter and St. Paul followed at once by the special work of St. JOHN.

“It was not till the removal of the first and the second Apostle from the scene of their earthly labors, that there burst upon the whole civilized world that awful train of calamities, which, breaking as it did on Italy, on Asia Minor, and on Palestine, almost simultaneously, though under the most different forms, was regarded alike by Roman, Christian and Jew, as the manifestation of the visible judgment of God.¹⁵⁹ It was now, if we may trust the testimony alike of internal and external proof—in the interval between the death of Nero and the fall of Jerusalem—when the roll of apostolical Epistles seemed to have been finally closed, when every other inspired tongue had been hushed in the grave—that there rose from the lonely rock of Patmos that solemn voice

¹⁵⁶ See chapter xx.
xv. § 4.

¹⁵⁷ Chapter xviii. § 20. Concerning the *Epistle of James* and that ascribed to Jude, see the Appendix.

¹⁵⁸ “For these calamities, and the effect produced by them on those who

witnessed them, compare, in Palestine, Joseph. *B. J.* vi. 5, § 3; Luke xix. 43, xxi. 20–24, xxiii. 28–30: in Asia Minor, 1 Pet. iv. 12–19; Rev. ii. 10, 13, iii. 10: in the Empire generally, Matt. xxiv. 6, 7; Tac. *Hist.* i. 1, 2.”

which mingled with the storm that raged around it, as the dirge of an expiring world; that under the "red and lowering sky," which had at last made itself understood to the sense of the dullest, there rose that awful vision of coming destiny, which has received the expressive name of the *Revelation of St. John the Divine*."¹⁶⁰

Captivating, however, as is this view of the Apocalypse, the weight of external testimony, which places the banishment of St. John to Patmos under Domitian, makes it more than doubtful whether we can adopt the symmetrical arrangement which would close the New Testament history with the fall of Jerusalem.¹⁶¹ But, though we may be compelled to place the great work of St. John, in his writings, after that event—as looking far forward into the future of the Christian Church—we may none the less regard the destruction of Jerusalem as the epoch at which Christianity emerged from its initiatory stage, with a Church completely organized, and numbering converts through the whole Roman Empire and even beyond its borders to the East, to replace Judaism as the witness for the one true God.

As the prophecy of that catastrophe finished the public testimony of Christ himself, so did its fulfillment set the seal to the work of his Apostles. The events themselves were not a more striking confirmation of the divine truth which had predicted them, than was the change that they effected the fulfillment of the divine plan of establishing a Church on earth; nay more, the anticipatory figure of the consummation of all God's dealings with his people in this world. This manifold aspect may be seen throughout that last and greatest of our Lord's prophecies; as indeed it is suggested by the very form of the question that called forth the discourse:—"Tell us, *when shall these things be*" (that is, the time when "there shall not be left here one stone upon another which shall not be thrown down"), "and what shall be the sign of *thy coming* and of the *end of the world?*"¹⁶² They who put the question were so far from having a clear notion of the different epochs it em-

¹⁶⁰ Stanley: *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, Serm. iv. pp. 247, 248.

¹⁶¹ Even if the earlier date of the Apocalypse could be proved, it would be almost impossible to include the Gospel and Epistles of John within the desired limits.

¹⁶² This great final prophecy, the climax of all the prophetic testimony

of the Old Covenant, and the foreshadowing of the accomplishment of the New, was uttered, as we have seen, on our Lord's last departure from the Temple. (See chap. xi. § 8. It is contained in Matt. xxiv., xxv.; Mark xiii.; Luke xxi.: with which must be compared similar utterances on other occasions, especially Luke xvii. 20-37, xix. 41-44.)

braced, that they were probably thinking of one and the same event; nor was it our Lord's purpose to give them an explanation of those "times and seasons" which he emphatically declares that "no man knoweth, no, not the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but my Father only."¹⁶³ It is no wonder, then, that a difficulty is still found in determining what parts of the discourse refer to the impending catastrophe of Jerusalem, and what to the final catastrophe of the world; for in truth, both subjects run through the discourse, in the relation of type and antitype. As the destruction of the Jewish polity and worship was, in reference to the past, the great climax of temporal judgment on those who had rejected God's ancient covenants, so in relation to the future, it forms the great type of the last judgment. Each of God's three dispensations toward the disobedient is closed by a catastrophe; and all three are included in our Lord's discourse: the reckless security of those who perished in the flood being a pattern of the folly both of the Jews and of the finally impenitent. The first of these was co-extensive with the race, which was placed, as a whole, under the patriarchal dispensation. The second closes the probation of the nation, who were chosen for the next experiment of the legal dispensation, with "great distress and wrath upon this people"—"tribulation such as was not since the beginning of the world: no, nor ever shall be." But that which gives tenfold force to the judgment, and forms the chief feature of its typical significance, is its relation to the advent and work of Christ himself. This is not only the key to the final prophecy, but Jesus had before intimated the same truth to the Pharisees who had asked him, "*When the kingdom of God should come,*" and he told them that "first, he must suffer many things, and be rejected of *this generation.*"¹⁶⁴ So likewise he declares to his disciples, "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." It was fit that the generation which, while confessing themselves the children of those who killed the prophets, filled up the measure of their fathers and brought upon themselves—by word as well as deed—all the blood of all the martyrs in the one crime of slaying Christ, should be the generation in whose time were "the days of vengeance, that *all things which were written might be fulfilled:*"—all the warnings of Moses and Joshua and all the prophets, all the ruin which Solomon, in the very act of dedicating the Temple, had prayed God to avert.

¹⁶³ Matt. xxiv. 36, Mark xiii. 32.¹⁶⁴ Luke xvii. 25.

But, so far from this being a limitation of the *whole discourse* to that time, it furnishes the very key to its typical character; for the temporal fate of those who rejected the grace which crowned the ancient covenant is the very image of the final doom of those who refuse God's last offer of mercy, and for whom there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins. From this point of view, we may discern the full sense of those phrases which form the key-note of the whole prophecy—the *coming of the Son of Man*—the *sign of the Son of Man*, coming with power and great glory—the *Son of Man in his day*—when *the Son of Man is revealed*—the *kingdom of God*, already *within* (or *among*) them—which had come, in its beginning *without observation*, but which, when all the antecedent signs should be accomplished,—then, and not till then, should suddenly be revealed, “as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven.”

In one sense, indeed, the anointed King could not but come *in his kingdom*. The herald of his advent proclaimed that kingdom as at hand; and he himself preached the Gospel of the Kingdom. His ministry was closed by his coming into the City and Temple amid Hosannas to the royal Son of David; the inscription on his cross confirmed the title which the Jews gave in the very act of disowning him; and, as the King of Glory, he burst the bands of death and entered the everlasting gates. But, in ascending to his throne, he left his kingdom upon earth to his chosen ministers, not only to bring the nations into subjection to him, but to convict the unbelieving Jews of having rejected their King:—“This Gospel of the kingdom must first be preached in all the world *for a witness* unto all nations; *and then shall the end come*.” the *end*, first of that inauguration of his kingdom, which was openly displayed when they who had rejected their King were rooted out from the place given to them by God; and when the seat of David's throne and of Solomon's sanctuary was abolished, to make way for that which prophecy had declared should at once and forever replace them, the kingdom that is not of this world, the sanctuary—neither on Zion, nor on any other mountain—where “the true worshipers worship the Father in spirit and in truth.”

Such is the general sense in which the destruction of Jerusalem completes the *First Advent* of Christ; and his own prophecy indicates with wonderful minuteness the signs by which his people were to see his coming, and to be warned against the false prophets and false Christs whose pre-

tensions were among those very signs. First come "wars, commotions, rumors of wars; nation set against nation, and kingdom against kingdom:"—and the whole East was in a ferment, and Judæa in open insurrection, while the armies of Spain and Gaul and Germany, Illyricum and Syria, converged upon Italy, to decide who should succeed to Nero's purple. The throes of inanimate nature seemed to sympathize with the travail of the world:—and the histories of the age are full of "famines, pestilences, and earthquakes in divers places." "Fearful sights and great signs from heaven" appeared to mark the very spot at which the great judgment was to descend:—a comet shaped like a scimitar hung over the devoted city during the whole year before the war. Other portents are recorded, in the very exaggeration of which we trace how "men's hearts failed them for fear, and for looking after those things which were coming on the earth:"—an agitation which found a voice for several successive years in the monotonous cry of the fanatic, Jesus the son of Ananus, "Woe! woe to Jerusalem! Woe! woe to the city and to the Temple." "All these were the *beginning of sorrows*." Meanwhile the persecution of the Christians was to confirm their testimony for Christ, and to sever them from the fate of the ungodly nation, while they waited to see it, "possessing their souls in patience," though not without danger to the steadfastness of many; till the spread of the Gospel through the known world should give the signal for the catastrophe. The new house of God was to be built before the old one was taken down.

The particular incidents, by which the disciples were to know the coming of the judgment, are next described with a minuteness which makes the prophecy the counterpart of the history of the siege. Before the foundations of the second Temple were laid, the prophet Daniel had predicted its desolation by the overspreading (or siege) of *abominations*, as an event following the cutting off of the Messiah.¹⁶⁸ That word *abomination* had a definite sense to a Jewish ear, denoting the objects of heathen worship; and their fathers had received warning of what were the very abominations by which the Holy City was to be laid desolate, when Pompey carried the standards consecrated to the heathen gods into the sanctuary of Jehovah. And now Christ warns his disci-

¹⁶⁸ Dan. ix. 26, 27. Our Lord's quotation of the prophet Daniel by name, with the emphatic addition, "whoso readeth, let him understand," is an irrefragable testimony to the genuineness and canonical authority of the book.

ples that when they should see the same *abomination* "standing where it ought not"—"in the holy place"—then they would "know that the *desolation* thereof is nigh:" and they must seek safety in a flight, the hurry, the danger, the distress of which he describes by the most striking images. The warning, neglected by the Jews, was heeded by the Christians. When they saw the standards—first of Cestius, and afterward of Vespasian—pitched upon the hill of Scopus, they recognized the sign, and, availing themselves of the respite caused by the news of Nero's death and the contest of the Empire, they obeyed their Lord's injunction to "flee unto the mountains." The Christians retired in a body to Pella, beyond the Jordan, which became the seat of the Church of Jerusalem, till Hadrian permitted them to return to the restored city. Their withdrawal was the extinction of the last element of spiritual life in the city; and the dead forms of Judaism were now only fit to be swept from the face of the earth in the manner which Christ had predicted before as well as now; when, in answer to the question, *Where these judgments should fall*, he replied, "Wheresoever the *carcase* is, thither will the *eagles* be gathered together."¹⁰⁰

The gathering horrors of the most terrible siege that perhaps the whole history of the world records, are described by our Lord in language not less impressive than the reality recorded by Josephus; and, besides this prophecy, we have another which traces each step with startling minuteness:—"For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall *cast a trench about thee*, and compass thee around, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."¹⁰¹ While Titus was completing his preparations at Cæsarea, almost the whole Jewish population left in the desolated country districts flocked to Jerusalem, to keep the Passover of A.D. 70, just one generation after that Passover at which they had refused their day of visitation and cut off the Messiah. Her children were still within her when, after an attempt to storm the city, the siege was converted into a blockade, and the fugitives, who fled from the unutterable horrors of famine and faction within the walls, perished between the lines, or were crucified in attitudes of cruel mockery to deter imitators.

We have already related the progress of the siege; the destruction of the Temple, in defiance of the most sacred in-

¹⁰⁰ Luke xvii. 37.

¹⁰¹ Luke xix. 43, 44.

instincts of Roman discipline; the razing of the city to its foundations; and it only remains to add the testimony borne by the very agent of all these horrors to the presence of a higher power than his own. Titus exhausted every resource of terror and conciliation to avert the ruin of the city and the profanation of the sanctuary. As his horse's hoofs trampled on the putrefying corpses that were thrown over from the walls, he lifted up his hands, and called the God of heaven to witness that this was not his work. When the tower of Antonia was razed, and his engines were brought up against the Temple, he first pleaded through Josephus, and afterward appeared in person at the gates, to expostulate with the zealots against bringing arms and blood into the courts where even a stranger's presence was profanation. "I call on your gods—I call on my whole army—I call on the Jews who are with me—I call on yourselves—to witness, that I do not force you to this crime. Come forth, and fight in any other place, and no Roman shall violate your sacred edifice." The rejection of this appeal, in reliance on the Messiah's appearance at the last moment to save his house, illustrates another feature of our Lord's prophecy. And when at last Titus was an eye-witness to the passive resistance of the massive stones against his mandate of destruction, he is reported to have exclaimed:—" *God has been my helper!* God it was that pulled down the Jews from those formidable walls; for what could the hands of men or their engines have availed against them?" The figures of the sacred furniture of the Temple, carved on the Arch of Titus at Rome, and the medals of Vespasian with the legend *JUDÆA CAPTA*, are the perpetual memorials of the utter removal of the ancient sanctuary; but not that heathenism might claim the conquest. The voice of our Lord had re-echoed the prophecy of Daniel, that "Jerusalem should be trodden down of the Gentiles, *till the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled;*" and God's providence had already given warning of the fate of heathenism in the burning of the Capitol eight months before the destruction of the Temple. The lesson is well pointed by the historian of the Roman Empire:—"Palestine was the cradle of the Gospel: the Jews the people first divinely appointed to expound it. The destruction—never to be repaired—of their material Temple *cut the cords which bound the new faith to its local habitation*, and launched it, under the hand of Providence, on its career of spiritual conquest; while the boasted restoration of the Capitol was a vain attempt to retain hold of the past, to revive the lost or perishing, to re-

attach to new conditions of thought an outworn creed of antiquity.”¹⁶⁸

Thus it is that the destruction of Jerusalem may well be called *the coming of the Son of Man*, not only in just judgment upon those who had rejected him; not only as a sovereign visits with desolation a rebellious province that has refused all offers of mercy: but as the completion of the first great step in the establishment of his kingdom upon earth. And since this is the most momentous revolutionary epoch in the religious history of the world, that ever was or that ever shall be, it is fitly made, in the rest of the discourse, the type of the “coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory,” to destroy all that is earthly and corrupt in the Church and world, to “gather his elect from the four winds of heaven,” to judge the quick and the dead, and to establish his everlasting kingdom.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁸ Merivale, vi. p. 606.

¹⁶⁹ We have purposely avoided all attempts to discriminate between the portions of this great prophecy that refer to the catastrophe of Jerusalem and to the Last Advent of Christ; regarding the latter not as—what some writers call it—“a new topic,” introduced at a definite point, but as one which, so to speak, underlies (or rather predominates over) the whole, coming out incidentally in several places, and decisively in the grand climax, and especially in Matt. xxv., which is an integral part of the discourse. This view, besides being that which alone does justice to the whole spirit of the discourse, removes the difficulty created by the interposition of passages which can not but refer to the greater event (Matt.

xxiv. 30, 31; Mark xiii. 26, 27) between those that describe the lesser. It deserves notice how much of the discourse is founded on the imagery in which the ancient prophets describe civil commotions and historical events. (See Is. xiii. 9, foll., xix, 1, 5, foll.; xxxiv. 2, 4, foll.; Ezek. xxxii. 2, 7; Ps. xviii. 7-14, lxviii. 1, foll.) Some commentators include within the scope of the prophecy not only the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, but the still more complete extirpation of the Jews of Palestine in the war of Barcocheba (the “Son of a Star”) under Hadrian, which ended in the foundation of the Roman colony of *Ælia Capitolina*, on the site of Jerusalem, with a temple of Jupiter in place of the Sanctuary on Zion.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

(A.) HYMENÆUS AND HIS HERESY.

THE name of HYMENÆUS occurs twice in the correspondence between St. Paul and Timothy; the first time classed with Alexander, and with him "delivered to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 20); and the second time classed with Philetus, and with him charged with having "erred concerning the truth, saying that the resurrection is past already," and thereby "overthrown the faith of some" (2 Tim. ii. 17, 18). These latter expressions, coupled with "the shipwreck of faith" attributed to Hymenæus in the context of the former passage (ver. 19), surely warrant our understanding both passages of the same person, notwithstanding the interval between the dates of the two letters. When the first was written, he had already made one proselyte; before the second was penned, he had seduced another: and if so, the only points further to be considered are, the error attributed to him, and the sentence imposed upon him.

I. The error attributed to him was one that had been in part appropriated from others, and has frequently been revived since with additions. What initiation was to the Pythagoreans, wisdom to the Stoics, science to the followers of Plato, contemplation to the Peripatetics, that

"knowledge" (*γνώσις*) was to the Gnostics. As there were likewise in the Greek schools those who looked forward to a complete restoration of all things (*ἀποκατάστασις*) so there was "a regeneration" (Tit. iii. 5; Matt. xix. 28), "a new creation" (2 Cor. v. 17, see Alford *ad loc.*; Rev. xxi. 1), "a kingdom of heaven and of Messiah or Christ" (Matt. xiii.; Rev. vii.)—and herein popular belief among the Jews coincided—unequivocally propounded in the N. T.; but *here* with this remarkable difference, namely, that, in a great measure, it was present as well as future—the same thing in germ that was to be had in perfection eventually. "The kingdom of God is within you," said our Lord (Luke xvii. 21). "He that is spiritual judgeth all things," said St. Paul (1 Cor. ii. 15). "He that is born of God can not sin," said St. John (1 Ep. iii. 9). There are likewise two deaths and two resurrections spoken of in the N. T.; the first of each sort, that of the soul to and from sin (John iii. 3-8), "the hour which now is" (*ibid.* v. 24, 25); the second, that of the body to and from corruption (1 Cor. xv. 36-44; also John v. 28, 29), which last is prospective. Now as the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was found to involve immense difficulties even in those early days (Acts xvii. 32; 1 Cor. xv. 35); while, on the other hand, there

was so great a predisposition in the then current philosophy (not even extinct now) to magnify the excellence of the soul above that of its earthly tabernacle, it was at once the easier and more attractive course to insist upon and argue from the force of those passages of Holy Scripture which enlarge upon the glories of the spiritual life that now is, under Christ, and to pass over or explain away allegorically all that refers to a future state in connection with the resurrection of the body. In this manner we may derive the first errors of the Gnostics, of whom Hymenæus was one of the earliest. They were on the spread when St. John wrote; and his grand-disciple, St. Irenæus, compiled a voluminous work against them (*Adv. Hær.*). A good account of their full development is given by Gieseler, *E. H.*, Per. I., Div. I. § 44, et. seq.

II. As regards the sentence passed upon him—it has been asserted by some writers of eminence (see Corn. à Lapide ad 1 Cor. v. 5) that the “delivering to Satan” is a mere synonym for ecclesiastical excommunication. Such can hardly be the case. The Apostles possessed many extraordinary prerogatives, which none have since arrogated. Even the title which they bore has been set apart to them ever since. The shaking off the dust of their feet against a city that would not receive them (Matt. x. 14), even though the same injunction was afterward given to the Seventy (Luke x. 11), and which St. Paul found it necessary to act upon twice in the course of his ministry (Acts xiii. 51, and xviii. 6), has never been a practice since with Christian ministers. “Anathema,” says Bingham, “is a word that occurs frequently in the ancient canons”

(*Antiq.* xvi. 2, 16), but the form “Anathema maranatha” is one that none have ever ventured upon since St. Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 22). As the Apostles healed all manner of bodily infirmities, so they seem to have possessed and exercised the same power in inflicting them—a power far too perilous to be continued when the manifold exigences of the Apostolical age had passed away. Ananias and Sapphira both fell down dead at the rebuke of St. Peter (Acts v. 5, 10); two words from the same lips, “Tabitha, arise,” sufficed to raise Dorcas from the dead (*ibid.* ix. 40.) St. Paul’s first act in entering upon his ministry was to strike Elymas the sorcerer with blindness, his own sight having been restored to him through the medium of a disciple (*ibid.* ix. 17, and xiii. 11); while soon afterward we read of his healing the cripple of Lystra (*ibid.* xiv. 8). Even apart from actual intervention by the Apostles, bodily visitations are spoken of in the case of those who approached the Lord’s Supper unworthily, when as yet no discipline had been established: “For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and a good number (*ἰκανοί*, in the former case it is *πολλοί*) sleep” (1 Cor. xi. 30).

On the other hand, Satan was held to be the instrument or executioner of all these visitations. Such is the character assigned to him in the book of Job (i. 6-12, ii. 1-7). Similar agencies are described 1 K. xxii. 19-22, and 1 Chr. xxi. 1. In Ps. lxxviii. 49, such are the causes to which the plagues of Egypt are assigned. Even our Lord submitted to be assailed by him more than once (Matt. iv. 1-10; Luke iv. 13 says, “departed from him *for a season*”); and “a messenger of Satan was sent

to buffet " the very Apostle whose act of delivering another to the same power is now under discussion. At the same time large powers over the world of spirits were authoritatively conveyed by our Lord to his immediate followers (to the Twelve, Luke ix. 1; to the Seventy, as the results showed, *ibid.* x. 17-20).

(B.) AUTHORITIES FOR THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL.

A very long catalogue might be made of authors who have written on St. Paul; among whom the following may be recommended as of some independent value. In English, the work of Messrs. Conybeare and Howson, on the *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, is at once the most comprehensive and the most popular. Among Commentaries, those of Professor Jowett on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, and of Dean Stanley on the Epistles to the Corinthians, are expressly designed to throw light on the Apostle's character and work. The general Commentaries of Dean Alford and Dr. Wordsworth include abundant matter upon every thing relating to St. Paul. So does Dr. Davidson's *Introduction to the New Testament*, which gives also in great profusion

the opinions of all former critics, English and foreign. Paley's well-known *Horæ Paulinæ*; Mr. Smith's work on the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*; Mr. Tate's *Continuous History of St. Paul*; and Mr. Lewin's *St. Paul*, are exclusively devoted to Pauline subjects. Of the many works in which the Apostle's Life and Labors are treated from the popular and practical point of view, the last and best is the Rev. Thos. Binney's *Lectures on St. Paul: his Life and Ministry*, London, 1866. Among German critics and historians the following may be named:—Ewald, in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. vi., and his *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*; Wieseler, *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, which is universally accepted as the best work on the chronology of St. Paul's life and times; De Wette, in his *Einleitung* and his *Exegetisches Handbuch*; Neander, *Pflanzung und Leitung der Christl. Kirche*; works on *Paulus*, by Baur, Hensen, Schrader, Schneckenburger; and the Commentaries of Olshausen, Meyer, etc. In French, the work of Salvador on *Jésus Christ et sa Doctrine*, in the chapter *St. Paul et l'Eglise*, gives the view of a modern Jew; and the *Discourses on St. Paul*, by M. de Pressensé, are able and eloquent.



Colosseum.

CHAPTER XX.

SUPPLEMENTAL HISTORY OF THE APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS, AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM. A.D. 70 AND ON- WARD.

- § 1. ST. JOHN, the survivor of the fall of Jerusalem. § 2. Three periods of his history—His early life. § 3. His life with Christ—The Sons of Thunder—Peter and John. § 4. St. John in the *Acts*—His departure from Judæa. § 5. St. John at Ephesus—His exile to Patmos. § 6. Traditions of St. John—Legend and time of his death—His title of *Theologus*—St. John the Evangelist. § 7. ST. ANDREW. § 8. JAMES the son of Zebedee. § 9. ST. JAMES THE LESS—His identity with James the son of Alphæus and James the brother of our Lord. § 10. The Apostle JUDE, the same as Lebbaeus and Thaddæus. § 11. SIMON THE ZEALOT, or the CANAANITE—Identity of the epithets. § 12. Judas Iscariot, and his successor ST. MATTHIAS. § 13. PHILIP the Apostle. § 14. BARTHOLOMEW, the same as NATHANAEL. § 15. MATTHEW, the same as Levi the Publican. § 16. THOMAS, surnamed Didymus. § 17. BARNABAS. § 18. Writers of the Gospels: when styled Evangelists—i. John, surnamed MARK—ii. LUKE. § 19. The Seven "Deacons"—i. ST. STEPHEN—ii. PHILIP the Evangelist—iii.

PROCHORUS—iv. NICANOR—v. TIMON—vi. PARMENAS—vii. NICOLAS, and the sect of the Nicolaitans. § 20. TITUS and TIMOTHY.

§ 1. The epoch of the destruction of Jerusalem, at which the Son of Man visited as a judge the city that had rejected its King, and inaugurated that spiritual kingdom upon earth which had now been established in churches gathered from every nation of the civilized world—that epoch does not close the New Testament History. One Apostle, of those whose names are prominent in the foundation of the Church, not only remained upon the earth to fulfill his work, but the more special part of that work—according to the views generally held of the date of his writings—may be said to have been but just beginning. It was not till the foundation of Christianity was historically complete, that the Apostle JOHN was divinely commissioned to utter prophecies of its future course, and to develop in his Epistles and Gospel those doctrinal aspects of our Lord's teaching which were needed to correct the heresies now rapidly taking their rise. As John the Baptist proclaimed the advent of Christ by the preaching of repentance to a degenerate people, so did John the Apostle recall churches that had already forsaken their first love and declined into heresy and vice, to prepare for His second coming.

§ 2. The prominent place filled by ST. JOHN in the Gospel history, as one of the four disciples who formed the innermost circle of our Lord's friends—the ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι—and the high distinction of being "the disciple whom Jesus loved," might raise our surprise at reading so little of him in the *Acts*, did we not reflect that his special work is to be sought for in his writings. The portion of his life which stands out in the broad day-light of the Gospels is preceded and followed by periods over which there brood the shadows of darkness and uncertainty. In the former, we discern only a few isolated facts, and are left to inference and conjecture to bring them together into something like a whole. In the latter we encounter, it is true, images more distinct, pictures more vivid; but with these there is the doubt whether the distinctness and vividness are not misleading—whether half-traditional, half-mythical narrative has not taken the place of history.

In most passages of the Gospels, John is named in connection with his brother James; and from the prevailing order it is inferred that he was the younger.¹ Their father was Zebedee, their mother Salome, whom tradition makes the

¹ Matt. iv. 21, x. 3, xvii. 1, etc.; but in Luke ix. 28 the order is inverted.

daughter of Joseph by his first wife, and consequently the half-sister to our Lord.³ They were brought up at Bethsaida, on the lake of Galilee, the town of that other pair of brothers—the sons of Jonas—who were to share with them the Lord's closest intimacy, and with whom we find them partners in their occupation of fishermen.⁴ The mention of the "hired servants," of Salome's "substance," of John's "own house," implies a position removed by at least some steps from absolute poverty.⁵ The fact that John was known to the high-priest Caiaphas—as that acquaintance was hardly likely to be formed with a disciple of Christ—suggests the probability of some early intimacy between the two families. Of Zebedee we know nothing beyond his interposing no refusal when his sons were called to leave him;⁶ and his disappearance from the Gospel narrative leads to the inference that his death set Salome free to join her children in ministering to the Lord. Her character presents to us the same great features that were conspicuous in her son. From her—who followed Jesus and ministered to him of her substance,⁷ who sought for her two sons that they might sit, one on his right hand, the other on his left, in his kingdom⁸—he might well derive his strong affections, his capacity for giving and receiving love, his eagerness for the speedy manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom.

The early years of the Apostle were passed under this influence. He would be trained in all that constituted the ordinary education of Jewish boyhood. Though not taught in the schools of Jerusalem, and therefore, in later life liable to the reproach of having no recognized position as a teacher, no Rabbinical education,⁹ he would yet be taught to read the Law and observe its precepts, to feed on the writings of the Prophets with the feeling that their accomplishment was not far off. For him too, as bound by the Law, there would be, at the age of thirteen, the periodical pilgrimages to Jerusalem. He would become familiar with the stately worship of the Temple, with the sacrifice, the incense, the altar, and the priestly robes. May we not conjecture that then the impressions were first made which never afterward wore off? Assuming that there is some harmony between the previous training of a prophet and the form of the visions presented to him, may we not recognize them in the rich liturgical imagery

³ Epiphan. iii. *Hæres.* 78. By some recent critics she has been identified with the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, in John xix. 25.

⁵ Luke v. 10.

⁴ Mark i. 20; Luke viii. 3; John xix. 27.

⁶ Matt. iv. 21.

⁷ Luke viii. 3. ⁸ Matt. xx. 20.

⁹ Acts iv. 13: comp. chap. xix. note 138.

of the Apocalypse—in that union in one wonderful vision of all that was most wonderful and glorious in the prediction of the older prophets?

Concurrently with this there would be also the boy's outward life as sharing in his father's work. The great political changes which agitated the whole of Palestine would in some degree make themselves felt even in the village town in which he grew up. The Galilean fisherman must have heard, possibly with some sympathy, of the efforts made (when he was too young to join in them) by Judas of Gamala, as the great assertor of the freedom of Israel against their Roman rulers. Like other Jews, he would grow up with strong and bitter feeling against the neighboring Samaritans. Lastly, before we pass into a period of greater certainty, we must not forget to take into account that to this period of his life belongs the commencement of that intimate fellowship with Simon Bar-jonah of which we afterward find so many proofs. That friendship may even then have been, in countless ways, fruitful for good upon the hearts of both.

§ 3. We have already seen, in the history of our Saviour's life, that John was probably one of the two disciples of John the Baptist (the other being Andrew) who were the first to obey their Master's direction to the "Lamb of God," and we have traced the chief incidents in his course as the disciple of Jesus Christ. Of the four who enjoyed their Lord's especial intimacy, while Peter appears as the leader of the apostolic band, to John belongs the higher distinction of being "the disciple whom Jesus loved;" and this love is returned with a more single undivided heart by him than by any other. If Peter is the *φιλόχριστος*, John is the *φιλιησοῦς*.⁹ Some striking facts indicate why this was so,—what was the character thus worthy of the love of Jesus of Nazareth. They hardly sustain the popular notion, which is fostered by the received types of Christian art, of a nature gentle, yielding, effeminate. The name *Boanerges* implies a vehemence, zeal, intensity, which gave to those who bore it the might of *Sons of Thunder*.¹⁰ That spirit broke out once and again,—when they joined their mother in asking for the highest places in the kingdom of their Master, and declared that they were able to drink of the cup that he drank, and to be baptized with the baptism that he was baptized with,¹¹—when they rebuked one who cast out devils in their Lord's name,¹² because he was not

⁹ Grotius, *Proleg. in Joann.*

¹⁰ Mark iii. 17.

¹¹ Matt. xx. 20-24; Mark x. 35-41.

¹² Luke ix. 49.

of their company,—when they sought to call down fire from heaven upon a village of the Samaritans.¹³

This energy added to the love of him who reclined at the Last Supper with his head upon his Master's breast the courage to follow him into the council-chamber of Caiaphas, and even the prætorium of Pilate,¹⁴ and to stand by his cross—with Christ's mother and his own, and Mary Magdalene—when all the rest forsook him and fled. There he received the sacred trust, which must have influenced all his subsequent home life, giving him a second mother in the blessed Virgin. He gave a home also to the penitent Peter; and when they, first of the Apostles, learned from Mary Magdalene the resurrection of the Lord, it throws a light upon their respective characters that John is the more impetuous, running on most eagerly to the rock-tomb; Peter, the less restrained by awe, is the first to enter in and look.¹⁵ So, too, when Jesus appeared to them by the Lake of Galilee, John is the first to recognize, in the dim form seen in the morning twilight, the presence of his risen Lord; Peter the first to plunge into the water and swim toward the shore where he stood calling to them.¹⁶ The last words of the Gospel reveal to us the deep affection which united the two friends. It is not enough for Peter to know his own future. That at once suggests the question—"Lord, and what shall this man do?" The reply of Jesus, which was perverted into the legends that gather about the close of St. John's life, surely means something more than a rebuke of Peter's curiosity. The words—"If I will that he tarry till I come"—are doubtless a prophecy, as well as an hypothesis; and they seem to intimate that, alone of all the Apostles, John should survive that catastrophe of the Old Dispensation in the destruction of Jerusalem, which made way for Christ's coming in his kingdom.¹⁷

§ 4. The association of Peter and John appears still in the opening scenes of the *Acts*—their attendance together to worship in the Temple—the miracle of healing the blind man—the confessorship before the Sanhedrim¹⁸—the gift of the Holy Ghost to those very Samaritans on whom John once wished to call down fire from heaven.¹⁹ This is his last appearance in the *Acts*; and he is not mentioned either in connection with Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion,²⁰ nor as engaged in labors like those of Peter at Lydda,

¹³ Luke xix. 54.

¹⁴ John xviii. 16, 19, 28.

¹⁵ John xx. 4-6: comp. p. 350.

¹⁶ John xxi. 7.

¹⁷ John xxi. 20-23.

¹⁸ Acts iii., iv. ¹⁹ Acts viii. 14.

²⁰ Acts xix. 26, 27. Gal. i. 19
| adds a proof that Paul did not see

Joppa, and Cæsarea, nor in the persecution in which the sword of Herod divided him from his brother James. Neither does St. John appear as taking an active part in the so-called "Council of Jerusalem;"²¹ but he was present at the private conference of the Apostles with Paul and Barnabas; and Paul names John, with James and Cephas, as a "pillar" of the Church, and as one of those whose mission it was to "go to the circumcision."²²

This one passage proves that the scene of John's labors thus far was Jerusalem and Judæa. To the work of teaching, organizing, and exhorting the Hebrew churches, may have been added special calls, like that which had drawn him with Peter to Samaria. The fulfillment of the solemn charge entrusted to John may have led him to a life of loving and reverent thought rather than to one of conspicuous activity. We may, at all events, feel sure that it was a time in which the natural elements of his character, with all their fiery energy, were being purified and mellowed, rising step by step to that high serenity which we find perfected in the closing portion of his life. The tradition which ascribes to him a life of celibacy²³ receives some confirmation from the absence of his name in 1 Cor. ix. 5. It harmonizes with all we know of his character, to think of his heart as so absorbed in the higher and diviner love that there was no room left for the lower and the human.

§ 5. After a long interval, the Apostle re-appears in that close connection with the churches of Asia Minor, which is attested alike by the Apocalypse and by the uniform tradition of the Church. It is a natural conjecture that he remained in Judæa till the death of the Virgin released him from his trust. Tradition carries him from Judæa to Ephesus; but it gives us no clear light as to the motives of his removal: the time is so variously fixed, under Claudius, Nero, or even Domitian, as to prove that nothing certain was known; and our only safe conclusion is to reject the two extremes.²⁴

The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul absolutely exclude the idea of any connection of St. John with Ephesus down to their date, that is to A.D. 66 at the earliest. On the other

John on this occasion; but it does not follow that the latter was not at Jerusalem. It is rather implied that Paul purposely abstained from seeing any of the Apostles save Peter and James.

²¹ Acts xv.

²² Gal. ii. 9.

²³ Tertullian, *de Monog.* c. xiii.

²⁴ Lampe fixes A.D. 66, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Roman forces under Cestius, as the most probable date.

hand it seems almost a necessary inference, from St. John's Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia, that the Apostle who writes to them with such high authority and such familiar knowledge of their condition, had already labored some time among them. This is in accordance with the analogy of St. Paul's letters to churches which he had recently visited—for example, the Thessalonians and Galatians; but these cases may also warn us not to exaggerate the time of the previous ministration. It is the plain meaning of John's own words, in the opening of the Apocalypse, that he had been banished as a Christian confessor to the island of Patmos at a *time of general persecution*; ²⁵ and the *place* seems to suggest that he had been arrested in the province of Asia.²⁶ Though his banishment *may* have resulted from some more local and temporary cause, the question has been generally narrowed to the issue between the two great persecutions under Nero and Domitian. The consent of Christian antiquity is in favor of the latter view: the former is a modern theory, based on the internal evidence of the Book, and connected with a particular scheme of interpretation.²⁷ Some of those who hold the later date regard the Apocalypse as the latest book

²⁵ Rev. i. 9. "Your companion in tribulation."

²⁶ The rocky islet of PATMOS is one of the group called *Sporades* (the scattered isles) in the Icarian Sea (the S.E. part of the Ægæan), at about equal distances S. of Samos and W. of Cape Posidium on the Carian coast. It must have been conspicuous on the right, when St. Paul was sailing from Samos to Cos. Its circuit was reckoned about thirty Roman miles (twenty-eight English). It has been fully described by the recent German and French travelers, Ross and Guérin. The aspect of the island is peculiarly rugged and bare.

Such a scene of banishment for St. John is quite in harmony with what we read of the custom of the period. It was the common practice to send exiles to the most rocky and desolate islands ("in asperimas insularum"). See Suet. *Tit.* 8; Juv. *Sat.* i. 73. Such a scene too was suitable (if we may presume to say so) to the sublime and awful Revelation which the

Apostle received there. It is possible, indeed, that there was more greenness in Patmos formerly than now. Its name in the Middle Ages was *Palmosa*. But this has now almost entirely given place to the old classical name; and there is just one palm-tree in the island, in a valley which is called "the Saint's Garden" (ὁ κήπος τοῦ Ὁσίου). Here and there are a few poor olives, about a score of cypresses, and other trees in the same scanty proportion.

Patmos is divided into two nearly equal parts, a northern and a southern, by a very narrow isthmus, where, on the east side, are the harbor and the town. On the hill to the south, crowning a commanding height, is the celebrated monastery, which bears the name of "John the Divine." Half-way up the ascent is the cave or grotto where tradition says that St. John received the Revelation, and which is still called τὸ σπήλαιον τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως.

²⁷ See the Appendix on the *Books of the New Testament*.

of the New Testament; but others place the Gospel and the Epistles after it.

§ 6. The tradition of the Church uniformly represents the Apostle as spending his last days at Ephesus, and the general outline of his work there may be gathered from the Revelation and the Epistles. The facts which these writings assert or imply are—(1) that, having come to Ephesus, some persecution, local or general, drove him to Patmos:²⁸ (2) that the Seven Churches, of which Asia was the centre, were special objects of his solicitude:²⁹ (3) that in his work he had to encounter men who denied the truth on which his faith rested;³⁰ and others who, with a railing and malignant temper, disputed his authority.³¹ If to this we add that he must have outlived all, or nearly all, of those who had been the friends and companions even of his maturer years—that this lingering age gave strength to an old imagination that his Lord had promised him immortality³²—that, as if remembering the actual words which had been thus perverted, the longing of his soul gathered itself up in the cry, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus”³³—that from some who spoke with authority he received a solemn attestation of the confidence they reposed in him³⁴—we have stated all that has any claim to the character of historical truth.

The picture which tradition fills up for us has the merit of being full and vivid, but it blends together, without much regard to harmony, things probable and improbable. He is shipwrecked off Ephesus, and arrives there in time to check the progress of the heresies which sprang up after St. Paul's departure. Then, or at a later period, he numbers among his disciples men like Polycarp, Papias, Ignatius. In the persecution under Domitian he is taken to Rome, and there, by his boldness, though not by death, gains the crown of martyrdom. The boiling oil into which he is thrown has no power to hurt him. He is then sent to labor in the mines, and Patmos is the place of his exile. The accession of Nerva frees him from danger, and he returns to Ephesus. There he settles the canon of the Gospel history by formally attesting the truth of the first three Gospels, and writing his own to supply what they left wanting. The elders of the Church are gathered together, and St. John, as by a sudden inspiration, begins with the wonderful opening, “In the beginning was the Word.” Heresies continue to show themselves, but he

²⁸ Rev. i. 9.²⁹ Rev. i. 11.³⁰ 1 John iv. 1; 2 John 7.³¹ 3 John 9, 10.³² John xxi. 23.³³ Rev. xxii. 20.³⁴ John xxi. 24.

meets them with the strongest possible protest. He refuses to pass under the same roof (that of the public baths of Ephesus) as their foremost leader, lest the house should fall down on them and crush them.²⁶ Through his agency the great temple of Artemis (Diana) is at length reft of its magnificence, and even leveled with the ground! He introduces and perpetuates the Jewish mode of celebrating Easter. At Ephesus, if not before, as one who was a true priest of the Lord, he bore on his brow the plate of gold (πέταλον) with the sacred name engraved on it, which was the badge of the Jewish pontiff. In strange contrast with this ideal exaltation, a later tradition tells us how the old man used to find pleasure in the playfulness and fondness of a favorite bird, and how he defended himself against the charge of unworthy trifling by the familiar apologue of the bow that must sometimes be unbent.

More true to the New Testament character of the Apostle is the story, told by Clement of Alexandria, of his special and loving interest in the younger members of his flock; of his eagerness and courage in the attempt to rescue one of them who had fallen into evil courses. The scene of the old and loving man, standing face to face with the outlaw chief whom, in days gone by, he had baptized, and winning him to repentance, is one which we could gladly look on as belonging to his actual life.

Not less beautiful is that other scene which comes before us as the last act of his life. When all capacity to work and teach is gone—when there is no strength even to stand—the spirit still retains the power to love, and the lips are still open to repeat, without change and variation, the command which summed up all his Master's will—"Little children, love one another."

The very time of the Apostle's death lies within the region of conjecture rather than of history, and the dates that have been assigned for it range from A.D. 89 to A.D. 120.

In relation to Christian doctrine, St. John is, as in the title of the Apocalypse, "John the Holy *Divine*"—the THEOLOGUS—not in the modern sense of a *theologian*, but from his

²⁶ Eusebius and Irenæus make CÉRINTHUS the heretic. In Epiphanius, EBION is the hero of the story. To modern feelings the anecdote may seem at variance with the character of the Apostle of Love, but it is hardly more than the development in act of the principle of 2 John 10. To the mind of Epiphanius there was a difficulty of another kind. Nothing less than a special inspiration could account for such a departure from an ascetic life as going to a bath at all.

witness that "the WORD was GOD."²⁶ This also was the fruit of his intimate converse with his Lord, and of a spirit fitted for such fellowship. Nowhere is the vision of the Eternal WORD, "the glory as of the only begotten of the Father," so unclouded: nowhere are there such personal reminiscences of the Christ in his most distinctively human characteristics. It was this union of the two aspects of the Truth which made him the instinctive opponent of all forms of a mystical or logical or docetic Gnosticism. It was a true feeling which led the later interpreters of the mysterious forms of the four living creatures round the throne—departing in this instance from the earlier traditions—to see in him the *Eagle* that soars into the highest heaven, and looks upon the unclouded sun." Descending from the regions of fancy to those facts on which the truth of the Gospel rests, it is this testimony to Christ that is so emphatically asserted alike in the opening of his General Epistle and in what we may call the *attestation clause* of his Gospel—whether that clause was penned by an inspired self-consciousness, or added as the testimony of those among whom he lived and wrote:—" *This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and we know that his testimony is true.*"²⁷

§ 7. When John the Baptist directed his disciples to the Lamb of God, "one of the two that heard John and followed Jesus was ANDREW, Simon Peter's brother;" and, in seeking out his own brother Simon, he set the first example of brotherhood in Christ, and was the first to proclaim, "We have found the Messiah."²⁸ The apparent discrepancy in Matt. iv. 18 ff., and Mark 16 ff., where the two appear to have

²⁶ It is in accordance with the old Hebrew system of significant surnames, that the proposition *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* was condensed into the epithet of *θεολόγος*. This at least is the explanation generally received; but the epithet of a "discourser of divine things," which had already been conferred upon Orpheus, Homer, and Hesiod, may have been applied in a higher sense to the seer of the Apocalypse.

The title has been perpetuated in the name of the modern village on the site of Ephesus, *Ayasaluk* = *ἅγιος θεολόγος*. Just in the same way, Bethany, the city of Lazarus, is called *el-'Asuriyeh*, or *Lazarieh*, and He-

bron, the chief abode of Abraham, *El-Halil*, the Friend (i. e., of God).

²⁷ Rev. iv. 7. The older interpretation makes Mark answer to the eagle, and John to the lion.

²⁸ John xxi. 24. The truer, as well as simpler view, seems to be that these words are the writer's own, as is evidently the case with the parallel passage in chap. xix. 35:—"And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and *he knoweth that he saith true*, that ye might believe."

²⁹ John i. 40, 41. The name Andrews occurs in Greek writers; it is found in Dion Cassius lxxviii. 82, as the name of a Cyrenian Jew in the reign of Trajan.

been called together, is no real one, St. John relating the first introduction of the brothers to Jesus, the other Evangelists their formal call to follow him in his ministry. In the catalogue of the Apostles, Andrew appears, in Matt. x. 2, Luke vi. 14, second, next after his brother Peter; but in Mark iii. 16, Acts i. 14, fourth, next after the three, Peter, James and John, and in company with Philip. And this appears to have been his real place of dignity among the Apostles; for in Mark xiii. 3, we find Peter, James, John and Andrew inquiring privately of our Lord about his coming; and in John xii. 22, when certain Greeks wished for an interview with Jesus, they applied through Andrew, who consulted Philip, and in company with him made the request known to our Lord. This last circumstance, combined with the Greek character of both their names, may perhaps point to some slight shade of Hellenistic connection on the part of the two Apostles; though it is extremely improbable that any of the Twelve were Hellenists in the proper sense. On the occasion of the five thousand in the wilderness wanting nourishment, it is Andrew who points out the little lad with the five barley loaves and the two fishes. Scripture relates nothing of him beyond these scattered notices. Whether he was Peter's elder or younger brother is uncertain. Except in the catalogue (i. 14), his name does not occur once in the *Acts*. The traditions about him are various. Eusebius⁴⁰ makes him preach in Scythia; Jerome⁴¹ and Theodoret⁴² in Achaia (Greece); Nicephorus⁴³ in Asia Minor and Thrace. He is said to have been crucified, at Patræ in Achaia, on a *crux decussata* (×); but this is doubted by many. Eusebius⁴⁴ speaks of an apocryphal *Acts of Andrew*.

§ 8. JAMES, THE SON OF ZEBEDEE,⁴⁵ and brother of John,

⁴⁰ *H. E.* iii. 1.

⁴¹ *Ep.* 148, *ad Marc.*

⁴² *ad Psalm.* cxvi.

⁴³ *H. E.* ii. 89.

⁴⁴ *H. E.* iii. 25.

⁴⁵ The name is the Greek form of JACOB, and it is somewhat remarkable that it now re-appears for the first time since the patriarch himself. In the unchangeable East, St. James is still St. Jacob—*Mar Yakoob*; but no sooner had the name left the shores of Palestine than it underwent a series of curious and interesting changes probably unparalleled in any other case. To the Greeks it became

Ἰάκωβος, with the accent on the first syllable; to the Latins, *Jacobus*, doubtless similarly accented, since in Italian it is *Iácomo* or *Giácomo*. In Spain it assumed two forms, apparently of different origins:—*Iago*—in modern Spanish, *Diego*, Portuguese, *Tiago*—and *Hayme* or *Jayne*, pronounced *Hayme*, with a strong initial guttural. In France it became *Jacques*, but another form was *Jame*, which appears in the metrical Life of St. Thomas á Becket by Garnier (A.D. 1170-74), quoted in Robinson's *Becket*, p. 139, note. From this last the transition to our James is easy.

another of the four who formed, so to speak, the *inner circle* of the Apostolic band, is the only one of the Apostles of whose life and death we can write with certainty. The little that we know of him we have on the authority of Scripture. All else that is reported is idle legend, with the possible exception of one tale, handed down by Clement of Alexandria to Eusebius, and by Eusebius to us. There is no fear of confounding the St. James of the New Testament with the hero of Compostella.

Of St. James's early life we know nothing. We first hear of him in A.D. 27, when he was called to be our Lord's disciple; and he disappears from view in A.D. 44, when he suffered martyrdom at the hands of Herod Agrippa I. He does not appear in the Gospel narrative till the second call of the disciples at the Lake of Galilee.⁴⁶ For a full year we lose sight of him. He is then, in the spring of A.D. 28, called to the apostleship with his eleven brethren.⁴⁷ In the list of the Apostles given us by St. Mark, and in the book of *Acts*, his name occurs next to that of Simon Peter: in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke it comes third. It is clear that in these lists the names are not placed at random. In all four, the names of Peter, Andrew, James and John are placed first; and it is plain that these four Apostles were at the head of the twelve throughout. Thus we see that Peter, James and John alone were admitted to the miracle of the raising of Jairus's daughter.⁴⁸ The same three Apostles alone were permitted to be present at the Transfiguration.⁴⁹ The same three alone were allowed to witness the Agony.⁵⁰ And it is Peter, James, John and Andrew who ask our Lord for an explanation of his dark sayings with regard to the end of the world and his second coming.⁵¹ It is worthy of notice that in all these places, with one exception,⁵² the name of James is put before that of John, and that John is twice described as "the brother of James."⁵³ This would appear to imply that at this time James, either from age or character, took a higher position than his brother. On the last occasion on which St. James is mentioned we find this position re-

⁴⁶ Matt. iv. 18-22; Mark i. 16-20; Luke v. 1-11. An ecclesiastical tradition, of uncertain date, places the residence of Zebedee and the birth of St. James at Japhia, now *Yafa*, near Nazareth. Hence that village is commonly known to the members of the Latin Church in that district as *San Giacomo*.

⁴⁷ Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 14; Luke vi. 13; Acts i. 13.

⁴⁸ Mark v. 37; Luke viii. 51.

⁴⁹ Matt. xvii. 1; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28.

⁵⁰ Matt. xxvi. 37; Mark xiv. 33.

⁵¹ Mark xiii. 3.

⁵² Luke ix. 28.

⁵³ Mark v. 37; Matt. xvii. 1.

versed. That the prominence of these three Apostles was founded on personal character (as out of every twelve persons there must be two or three to take the lead), and that it was not an office held by them, can scarcely be doubted.

It would seem to have been at the time of the appointment of the twelve Apostles that the name of *BOANERGES* was given to the sons of Zebedee. It might, however, like Simon's name of Peter, have been conferred before. This name plainly was not bestowed upon them because they heard the voice like thunder from the cloud (Jerome), nor because of any peculiar majesty in their persons or impressiveness in their preaching; but it was, like the name given to Simon, at once descriptive and prophetic. The "Rockman" had a natural strength, which was described by his title, and he was to have a divine strength, predicted by the same title. In the same way the "Sons of Thunder" had a burning and impetuous spirit, which twice exhibits itself in its unchastened form,⁶⁶ and which, when moulded by the Spirit of God, taking different shapes, led St. James to be the first Apostolic martyr, and St. John to become in an especial manner the Apostle of Love. The occasions on which this natural character manifested itself have been noticed in speaking of St. John.

From the time of the Agony in the Garden, A.D. 30, to the time of his martyrdom, A.D. 44, we know nothing of St. James except that after the Ascension he persevered in prayer with the other Apostles, and the women, and the Lord's brethren.⁶⁶ In the year 44 Herod Agrippa I., son of Aristobulus, was ruler of all the dominions which at the death of his grandfather, Herod the Great, had been divided between Archelaus, Antipas, Philip, and Lysanias. He had received from Caligula, Trachonitis in the year 37, Galilee and Peræa in the year 40. On the accession of Claudius, in the year 41, he received from him Idumæa, Samaria, and Judæa. This sovereign was at once a supple statesman and a stern Jew:⁶⁷ a king with not a few grand and kingly qualities, at the same time eaten up with Jewish pride—the type of a lay Pharisee. "He was very ambitious to oblige the people with donations," and "he was exactly careful in the observance of the laws of his country, keeping himself entirely pure, and not allowing one day to pass over his head without its appointed sacrifice."⁶⁷ Policy and inclination would alike lead such a mon-

⁶⁶ Luke ix. 54; Mark x. 37.

⁶⁶ Acts i. 13.

⁶⁶ Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 6, § 7, xix. 5-8.

⁶⁷ Joseph. *Ant.* xix. 7, § 8.

arch "to lay hands" (*not* "stretch forth his hands," A.V. Acts xii. 1) "on certain of the church;" and accordingly, when the Passover of the year 44 had brought St. James and St. Peter to Jerusalem, he seized them both, considering doubtless that if he cut off the "Son of Thunder" and the "Rockman" the new sect would be more tractable or more weak under the presidency of James the Just, for whose character he probably had a lingering and sincere respect. James was apprehended first—his natural impetuosity of temper would seem to have urged him on even beyond Peter. And "Herod the king," the historian simply tells us, "killed James the brother of John with the sword."⁸⁸ This is all we know for certain of his death.⁸⁹ We may notice two things respecting it—first, that James is now described as the brother of John, whereas previously John had been described as the brother of James, showing that the reputation of John had increased, and that of James diminished, by the time that St. Luke wrote; and secondly, that he perished not by stoning, but by the sword. The Jewish law laid down that if seducers to strange worship were few, they should be stoned; if many, that they should be beheaded. Either therefore Herod intended that James's death should be the beginning of a sanguinary persecution, or he merely followed the Roman custom of putting to death from preference.⁹⁰

§ 9. The death of so prominent a champion left a huge gap in the ranks of the infant society, which was filled partly by ST. JAMES, the brother of our Lord, commonly called JAMES

⁸⁸ Acts xii. 2.

⁸⁹ The great Armenian convent at Jerusalem on the so-called Mount Zion is dedicated to "St. James the son of Zebedee." The church of the convent, or rather a small chapel on its north-east side, occupies the traditional site of his martyrdom. This, however, can hardly be the actual site (Williams, *Holy City*, ii. 558). Its most interesting possession is the chair of the Apostle, a venerable relic, the age of which is perhaps traceable as far back as the 4th century (Williams, 560). But as it would seem that it is believed to have belonged to "the first Bishop of Jerusalem," it is doubtful to which of the two Jameses the tradition would attach it.

⁹⁰ See Lightfoot, *in loc.* Clement

of Alexandria relates, concerning St. James's martyrdom, that the prosecutor was so moved by witnessing his bold confession that he declared himself a Christian on the spot: accused and accuser were therefore hurried off together, and on the road the latter begged St. James to grant him forgiveness; after a moment's hesitation, the Apostle kissed him, saying, "Peace be to thee!" and they were beheaded together. For legends respecting his death and his connection with Spain, see the Roman Breviary (*in Fest. S. Jac. Ap.*), in which the healing of a paralytic and the conversion of Hermogenes are attributed to him, and where it is asserted that he preached the Gospel in Spain, and that his remains were translated to Compostella. The legends are re-

THE LESS, or the LITTLE,^{60b} who now steps forth into greater prominence in Jerusalem, and partly by St. Paul, who had now been seven years a convert, and who shortly afterward set out on his first Apostolic journey. The position into which the former now comes forward leads us to depart from the order of the Gospel lists. We have already stated the reasons for identifying him with James, the son of Alphæus.⁶¹ Of the father of James, whose Hebrew name is rendered by St. Matthew and St. Mark *Alphæus*,⁶² and by St. John *Clopas*,⁶³ we know nothing, except that he married Mary, the sister of the Virgin Mary, and had by her four sons and three or more daughters.⁶⁴ He appears to have died before the commencement of our Lord's ministry, and after his death it would seem that his wife and her sister, a widow like herself, and in poor circumstances, lived together in one house, generally at Nazareth,⁶⁵ but sometimes also at Capernaum⁶⁶ and Jerusalem.⁶⁷ It is probable that these cousins, or, as they were usually called, brothers and sisters, of the Lord were older than himself; as on one occasion we find them, with his mother, indignantly declaring that he was beside himself, and going out to "lay hold of him" and compel him to moderate his zeal in preaching, at least sufficiently "to eat bread."⁶⁸ This looks like the conduct of elders toward one younger than themselves.

Of James individually we know nothing till the spring of the year 28, when we find him, together with his younger brother Jude, called to the Apostolate. It has been noticed that in all the four lists of the Apostles, James holds the same place, heading the third class, consisting of himself, Jude, Simon and Iscariot; as Philip heads the second class, consisting of himself, Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew; and Simon Peter the first, consisting of himself, Andrew, James and John.⁶⁹ The fact of Jude being described by reference


jected with contempt even by Catholic writers. Epiphanius, without giving or probably having any authority for or against his statement, reports that St. James died unmarried, and that, like his namesake, he lived the life of a Nazarite.

^{60b} Mark xiii. 40, Ἰάκωβος ὁ μικρός.

⁶¹ Chap. ix., *Notes and Illustrations* (A).

⁶² Ἀλφαῖος.

⁶³ Κλωπᾶς.



⁶⁵ Matt. xiii. 55.

⁶⁶ John ii. 12.

⁶⁷ Acts i. 14.

⁶⁸ Mark iii. 20, 21, 31.

⁶⁹ Alford, in *Matt. x. 2*.

to James,⁷⁰ shows the name and reputation which James had, either at the time of the calling of the Apostles or at the time when St. Luke wrote.

It is not likely (though far from impossible) that James and Jude took part with their brothers and sisters, and the Virgin Mary, in trying "to lay hold on" JESUS in the autumn of the same year;⁷¹ and it is likely, though not certain, that it is of the other brothers and sisters, without these two, that St. John says, "Neither did his brethren believe on him,"⁷² in the autumn of A.D. 29.

We hear no more of James till after the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. At some time in the forty days that intervened between the Resurrection and the Ascension, the Lord appeared to him. This is not related by the Evangelists, but it is mentioned by St. Paul;⁷³ and there never has been any doubt that it was to this James rather than to the son of Zebedee that the manifestation was vouchsafed. We may conjecture that it was for the purpose of strengthening him for the high position which he was soon to assume in Jerusalem, and of giving him the instructions on "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God,"⁷⁴ which were necessary for his guidance, that the Lord thus showed himself to James. We can not fix the date of this appearance. It was probably only a few days before the Ascension; after which we find James, Jude, and the rest of the Apostles, together with the Virgin Mary, Simon and Joses, in Jerusalem, awaiting in faith and prayer the outpouring of the Pentecostal gift.

Again we lose sight of James for ten years, and when he appears once more it is in a far higher position than any that he has yet held. In the year 37 occurred the conversion of Saul. Three years after his conversion he paid his first visit to Jerusalem, but the Christians recollected what they had suffered at his hands, and feared to have any thing to do with him. Barnabas, at this time of far higher reputation than himself, took him by the hand, and introduced him to Peter and James,⁷⁵ and by their authority he was admitted into the society of the Christians, and allowed to associate freely with them during the fifteen days of his stay. Here we find James on a level with Peter, and with him deciding on the admission of St. Paul into fellowship with the Church at Jerusalem; and from henceforth we always find him equal, or in his own department superior, to the very chiefest Apos-

⁷⁰ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.

⁷¹ Mark iii. 21. ⁷² John vii. 5.

⁷³ 1 Cor. xv. 7.

⁷⁴ Acts i. 3.

⁷⁵ Acts ix. 27; Gal. i. 18, 19.

cles, Peter, John and Paul. For by this time he had been appointed (at what exact date we know not) to preside over the infant Church in its most important centre, in a position equivalent to that of Bishop. This pre-eminence is evident throughout the after-history of the Apostles, whether we read it in the Acts, in the Epistles, or in ecclesiastical writers. Thus in the year 44, when Peter is released from prison, he desires that information of his escape may be given to "James, and to the brethren."⁷⁶ In the year 49 he presides at the Apostolic Council, and delivers the judgment of the Assembly, with the expression "Wherefore my sentence is."⁷⁷ In the same year (or perhaps in the year 51, on his fourth visit to Jerusalem) St. Paul recognizes James as one of the pillars of the Church, together with Cephas and John,⁷⁸ and places his name before them both. Shortly afterward it is "certain who came from James," that is, from the mother Church of Jerusalem, designated by the name of its Bishop, who led Peter into tergiversation at Antioch. And in the year 57 Paul pays a formal visit to James in the presence of all his presbyters, after having been previously welcomed with joy the day before by the brethren in an unofficial manner.⁷⁹

Entirely accordant with these notices of Scripture is the universal testimony of Christian antiquity to the high office held by James in the Church of Jerusalem. That he was formally appointed Bishop of Jerusalem by the Lord himself, as reported by Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Proclus of Constantinople, and Photius, is not likely. Eusebius follows this account in a passage of his history, but says elsewhere that he was appointed by the Apostles. Clement of Alexandria is the first author who speaks of his Episcopate, and he alludes to it as a thing of which the chief Apostles, Peter, James and John, might well have been ambitious. The same Clement reports that the Lord, after his resurrection, delivered the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John, and to Peter, who delivered it to the rest of the Apostles, and they to the Seventy. This at least shows the estimation in which James was held. But the author to whom we are chiefly indebted for an account of the life and death of James is Hegesippus (*i. e.*, Joseph), a Christian of Jewish origin, who lived in the middle of the second century. His narrative gives us such an insight into the position of St. James in the Church of

⁷⁶ Acts xii. 17.—⁷⁷ *Διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω*, Acts xv. 13, 19; see St. Chrys. *in loc.*—
⁷⁸ Gal. ii. 9.—⁷⁹ Acts xxi. 18.

Jerusalem, that it is best to let him relate it in his own words :

. *Tradition respecting James, as given by Hegesippus.*—
“With the Apostles, James, the brother of the Lord, succeeds to the charge of the Church—that James who has been called Just from the time of the Lord to our own days, for there were many of the name of James. He was holy from his mother’s womb, he drank not wine or strong drink, nor did he eat animal food ; a razor came not upon his head ; he did not anoint himself with oil ; he did not use the bath. He alone might go into the holy place ; for he wore no woollen clothes, but linen. And alone he used to go into the Temple, and there he was commonly found upon his knees, praying for forgiveness for the people, so that his knees grew dry and thin [generally translated *hard*] like a camel’s, from his constantly bending them in prayer, and entreating forgiveness for the people. On account therefore of his exceeding righteousness he was called ‘Just,’ and ‘Oblias,’ which means in Greek ‘the bulwark of the people,’ and ‘righteousness,’ as the prophets declare of him. Some of the seven sects then that I have mentioned inquired of him, ‘What is the door of Jesus?’ And he said that this man was the Saviour, wherefore some believed that Jesus is the Christ. Now the forementioned sects did not believe in the Resurrection, nor in the coming of one who shall recompense every man according to his works ; but all who became believers believed through James. When many therefore of the rulers believed, there was a disturbance among the Jews, and Scribes, and Pharisees, saying, ‘There is a risk that the whole people will expect Jesus to be the Christ.’ They came together therefore to James, and said, ‘We pray thee, stop the people, for they have gone astray after Jesus as though he were the Christ. We pray thee to persuade all that come to the Passover concerning Jesus : for we all give heed to thee, for we and all the people testify to thee that thou art just, and acceptest not the person of man. Persuade the people therefore not to go astray about Jesus, for the whole people and all of us give heed to thee. Stand therefore on the gable of the Temple, that thou mayest be visible, and that thy words may be heard by all the people ; for all the tribes and even the Gentiles are come together for the Passover.’ Therefore the forementioned Scribes and Pharisees placed James upon the gable of the Temple, and cried out to him, and said, ‘O Just one, to whom we ought all to give heed, seeing that the people are going astray after Jesus who was crucified, tell us what is the door

of Jesus?' And he answered with a loud voice, 'Why ask ye me about Jesus the Son of Man? He sits in heaven on the right hand of great power, and will come on the clouds of heaven.' And many were convinced and gave glory on the testimony of James, crying 'Hosannah to the Son of David.' Whereupon the same Scribes and Pharisees said to each other, 'We have done ill in bringing forward such a witness to Jesus; but let us go up, and throw him down, that they may be terrified, and not believe on him.' And they cried out, saying, 'Oh! oh! even the Just is gone astray.' And they fulfilled that which is written in Isaiah, 'Let us take away the just man, for he is displeasing to us; therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their deeds.' They went up therefore, and threw down the Just one, and said one to another, 'Let us stone James the Just.' And they began to stone him, for he was not killed by the fall; but he turned round, and knelt down, and cried, 'I beseech thee, Lord God Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' And while they were stoning him, one of the priests, of the sons of Rechab, a son of the Rechabites, to whom Jeremiah the prophet bears testimony, cried out and said, 'Stop! What are you about? The Just one is praying for you!' Then one of them, who was a fuller, took the club with which he pressed the clothes, and brought it down on the head of the Just one. And so he bore his witness. And they buried him on the spot by the Temple, and the column still remains by the Temple. This man was a true witness to Jews and Greeks that Jesus is the Christ. And immediately Vespasian commenced the siege."⁶⁰

For the difficulties which occur in this extract, reference may be made to Routh's *Reliquiæ Sacræ*,⁶¹ and to Dean Stanley's *Apostolical Age*.⁶² It represents St. James to us in his life and in his death more vividly than any modern words could picture him. We see him, a married man perhaps,⁶³ but in all other respects a rigid and ascetic follower after righteousness, keeping the Nazarite rule, like Anna the prophetess,⁶⁴ serving the Lord in the Temple "with fastings and prayers night and day," regarded by the Jews themselves as one who had attained to the sanctity of the priesthood, though

⁶⁰ Euseb. ii. 23, and Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* p. 208, Oxf. 1846. The last words, which are usually considered as at variance with Josephus, need not, however, be taken as giving a precise indication of the time of St. James's martyrdom, but rather as connecting the crime with the retribution that soon followed it.

⁶¹ Vol. i., p. 228.

⁶² Page 319, Oxf. 1847.

⁶³ 1. Cor. ix. 5. ⁶⁴ Luke ii. 37.

not of the priestly family or tribe (unless indeed we argue from this that Clopas did belong to the tribe of Levi, and draw thence another argument for the identity of James the son of Clopas and James the Lord's brother), and as the very type of what a righteous or just man ought to be. If any man could have converted the Jews, as a nation, to Christianity, it would have been James.

Josephus, as already more than once referred to, says that in the interval between the death of Festus and the coming of Albinus, Ananus the high-priest assembled the Sanhedrim, and "brought before it James the brother of him who is called Christ, and some others, and having charged them with breaking the laws, delivered them over to be stoned." The historian adds that the better part of the citizens disliked what was done, and complained of Ananus to Agrippa and Albinus, whereupon Albinus threatened to punish him for having assembled the Sanhedrim without his consent, and Agrippa deprived him of the high-priesthood.⁸⁵ The words "brother of him who is called Christ" are judged by many to be spurious.

Epiphanius gives the same account that Hegesippus does, in somewhat different words, having evidently copied it for the most part from him. He adds a few particulars which are probably mere assertions or conclusions of his own.⁸⁶ He considers James to have been the son of Joseph by a former wife, and calculates that he must have been ninety-six years old at the time of his death; and adds, on the authority, as he says, of Eusebius, Clement, and others, that he wore the *πέταλον* on his forehead, in which he probably confounds him with St. John.⁸⁷ Gregory of Tours reports that he was buried, not where he fell, but on the Mount of Olives,⁸⁸ in a tomb in which he had already buried Zacharias and Simeon.

We have seen that there may be a reference to James in

⁸⁵ Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 9.

⁸⁶ *Hæres.* xxix. 4, and lxxviii. 13.

⁸⁷ Polycr. apud Euseb. *II. E.* v. 24.

⁸⁸ The monument—part excavation, part edifice—which is now commonly known as the "Tomb of St. James," is on the east side of the so-called Valley of Jehoshaphat, and therefore at a considerable distance from the spot on which the Apostle was killed, which the narrative of Hegesippus would seem to fix as somewhere under the south-east cor-

ner of the wall of the *Haram*, or perhaps further down the slope nearer the "Fountain of the Virgin." It can not at any rate be said to stand "by the Temple." The tradition about the monument in question is that St. James took refuge there after the capture of Christ, and remained, eating and drinking nothing, until our Lord appeared to him on the day of his resurrection. By the old travelers it is often called the "Church of St. James."

Heb. xiii. 7, which would fix his death at some time previous to the writing of that Epistle. His apprehension by Ananus was probably about the year 62 or 63. There is nothing to fix the date of his martyrdom as narrated by Hegesippus, except that it must have been shortly before the commencement of the siege of Jerusalem. We may conjecture that he was between seventy and eighty years old."

§ 10. Still following the connection of name with name, rather than the order of the lists of the Apostles, we come to the second person of the third group, JUDE or JUDAS (that is Judah), "the brother of James," as he is called by our translators,⁹⁰ and as he distinctly calls himself, if he be the author of the *Epistle of Jude*.⁹¹ It can not be doubted that the same Apostle is meant in the passage of St. John's Gospel where he is called simply Judas, but distinguished from Judas Iscariot.⁹² The one question which he addresses to the Lord—"How is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?"—a question which shows him as sharing the low temporal views of his Master's kingdom—and the mention of him as abiding with the other Apostles at Jerusalem, in prayer and supplication, after the Ascension, are the only special notices of him.

But, on comparing the lists of the Apostles given by the three Evangelists, we find the place occupied by the name of *Jude*, in Luke, filled by that of *Lebbæus* in Matthew, and that of *Thaddæus* in Mark.⁹³ All the discussion which the variety has

⁹⁰ It is almost unnecessary to say that the Jacobite churches of the East—consisting of the Armenians, the Copts, and other Monophysite or Eutychian bodies—do not derive their title from St. James, but from a later person of the same name, Jacob Baradaeus, who died Bishop of Edessa in 588.

⁹⁰ Luke vi. 17; Acts i. 13. 'Ιούδας 'Ιακώβου. The question, whether the ellipsis should be supplied by "brother" or "son" has been discussed above.

⁹¹ Jude 1: ἀδελφὸς δὲ 'Ιακώβου. Concerning the Epistle, see the Appendix.

⁹² John xiv. 22. 'Ιούδας, οὐχ ὁ 'Ισκαριώτης.

⁹³ Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18. Jude occupies the *eleventh* place in Luke's list, while Lebbæus and Thaddæus

stand *tenth* in those of Matthew and Mark; there being a similar transposition in that of Simon the Zealot, which is common to all three. In Matthew the A.V. has "Lebbæus, whose surname was Thaddæus;" but the words ὁ ἐπικλήθεις Θαδδαῖος are wanting from the best MSS. In both places there is considerable variety of reading; some MSS. having both in St. Matthew and St. Mark Λεββαῖος or Θαδδαῖος alone; others introducing the name 'Ιούδας or *Judas Zelotes* in St. Matthew, where the Vulgate reads *Thaddæus* alone, which is adopted by Lachmann in his Berlin edition of 1832. This confusion is still further increased by the tradition preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13) that the true name of Thomas (the twin) was Judas ('Ιούδας ὁ καὶ Θωμᾶς), and that Thaddæus was one of the "Seventy."

provoked does but lead back to the plain inference, generally accepted, that *Jude*, *Lebbæus* and *Thaddæus* were three names for one and the same Apostle, who is therefore said by Jerome to have been *trionymus*.

Nothing is certainly known of the later history of the Apostle. There may be some truth in the tradition which connects him with the foundation of the Church at Edessa; though here again there is much confusion, and doubt is thrown over the account by its connection with the worthless fiction of "Abgarus king of Edessa."⁹⁴ Nicephorus⁹⁵ makes Jude die a natural death in that city after preaching in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. The Syrian tradition speaks of his abode at Edessa, but adds that he went thence to Assyria, and was martyred in Phœnicia on his return; while that of the west makes Persia the field of his labors and the scene of his martyrdom.⁹⁶

§ 11. The name of SIMON THE CANAANITE, or ZELOTES, completes (with the exception of Judas Iscariot) the third group of the Apostles, occupying the eleventh place in Matthew and Mark, and the tenth in Luke.⁹⁷ The two epithets attached to his name have the same signification, the latter being the Greek translation of the former, which is Chaldee. Both point him out as belonging to the faction of the *Zealots*, who were distinguished for their fierce advocacy of the Mosaic ritual, and who played so conspicuous a part in the last defense of Jerusalem. We have here a proof of the varied characters gathered together in the Apostolic band.

Simon is not mentioned in the New Testament, except in the lists of the Apostles. He is reported, on very doubtful authority, to have preached in Egypt, Cyrene and Mau-

identified by Jerome in *Matt.* x. with "Judas Jacobi;" as well as by the theories of modern scholars, who regard the "Levi" (Λευὶς ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου) of Mark ii. 14, Luke v. 27, who is called "Leb s" (Λεβὶς) by Origen (*contra Cel.* i. i. § 62), as the same with Lebbæus. No satisfactory explanation has been given of the names *Lebbæus* or *Thaddæus*.

⁹⁴ Enseb. *H. E.* i. 18; Jerome, *Comment. in Matt.* x.

⁹⁵ *H. E.* ii. 40.

⁹⁶ The resemblance of the state of things described in the Epistle of Jude to that in the Second Epistle of Peter confirms the view that both minis-

tered and wrote to the Jews of the Asiatic Dispersion.

⁹⁷ *Matt.* x. 4, Σίμων ὁ καναναῖος (καναν τῆς in Text. Recept.), and so Mark iii. 18. The epithet represents the Chaldee word for *zealot*, and has nothing to do with the land of Canaan or the village of Cana. The Greek equivalent is used only by St. Luke, Σίμων ὁ καλούμενος ζηλωτής, Luke vi. 15, Acts i. 13. The term *κανανιτης* seems to have survived the Greek form in the traditions of the Church.

His identification with Simon the brother of Jesus has already been discussed. See chap. ix., *Notes and Illustrations* (A).

retania, and to have been crucified in Judæa under Domitian.

§ 12. Of JUDAS ISCARIOT,⁹⁹ who stands last in this third group, all that is historical has been related in the Gospel History; and the solemn lessons taught by his character and fate lie beyond the province of this work. But his place was not left vacant in the foundation of the Apostolic Church. "Another took the office" of the fallen Apostle, when MATTHIAS was chosen in the manner previously related.¹⁰⁰ All that we know of Matthias for certain beyond this is that he had been a constant attendant upon the Lord Jesus during the whole course of his ministry; for such was declared by St. Peter to be the necessary qualification of one who was to be a witness of the resurrection. The name of Matthias occurs in no other place in the New Testament, and we may accept as probable the opinion which is shared by Eusebius¹⁰¹ and Epiphanius,¹⁰² that he was one of the seventy disciples. It is said that he preached the Gospel and suffered martyrdom in Ethiopia.¹⁰³ An apocryphal gospel was published under his name,¹⁰⁴ and Clement of Alexandria quotes from the Traditions of Matthias.¹⁰⁵

§ 13. The middle group in the list of the Apostles consists of four names, each of which has some peculiar interest, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas.¹⁰⁶ These four, though not sharing the same intimate converse with their Master as Peter and Andrew, James and John, are much more prominent in the Gospel narrative than the last four. Two of them were among our Saviour's first disciples; Matthew was one of his early converts; and Thomas, whose name stands in close connection with Matthew, probably became a disciple before any of the third group.

At the head of this second group stands PHILIP. He is mentioned as being of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter,¹⁰⁷ and apparently was among the Galilean peasants of that district who flocked to hear the preaching of the Baptist. The manner in which St. John speaks of him, the repetition by him of the self-same words with which Andrew had brought to Peter the good news that the Christ had at last

⁹⁹ Of the various derivations of the epithet, the probable are, either from *Kerioth* in Judah—in which case he would be the only exception to the Galilean origin of the Apostles—or from *Kartha* in Galilee.

¹⁰⁰ Acts i. 15-26. See chap. xiii. § 3.

¹⁰¹ *H. E.* lib. i. 12. ¹⁰² *Hæres.* i. 20.

¹⁰³ Nicephor. ii. 60.

¹⁰⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 23.

¹⁰⁵ *Strom.* ii. 163, etc.

¹⁰⁶ This is the order of Mark (iii. 18), and Luke (vi. 14, 15); while Matthew, evidently in the spirit of humility, not only places his own name after that of Thomas, but adds the description, "the publican" (x. 8).

¹⁰⁷ John i. 44.

appeared, all indicate a previous friendship with the sons of Jonah and of Zebedee, and a consequent participation in their Messianic hopes. The close union of the two in John vi. and xii. suggests that he may have owed to Andrew the first tidings that the hope had been fulfilled. The statement that Jesus *found* him ¹⁰⁷ implies a previous seeking. To him first, in the whole circle of the disciples, were spoken the words so full of meaning, "Follow me." As soon as he has learned to know his Master, he is eager to communicate his discovery to another who had also shared the same expectations. He speaks to Nathanael, probably on his arrival in Cana,¹⁰⁸ as though they had not seldom communed together of the intimations of a better time, of a divine kingdom, which they found in their sacred books. We may well believe that he, like his friend, was an "Israelite indeed in whom there was no guile." In the lists of the twelve Apostles in the synoptic Gospels, his name is as uniformly at the head of the second group of four as the name of Peter is at that of the first;¹⁰⁹ and the facts recorded by St. John give the reason for this priority. In those lists again we find his name uniformly coupled with that of Bartholomew, and this has led to the hypothesis that the latter is identical with the Nathanael of John i. 45, the one being the personal name, the other, like Bar-jonah or Bartimæus, a patronymic.

Philip apparently was among the first company of disciples who were with the Lord at the commencement of his ministry, at the marriage of Cana, and on his first appearance as a prophet in Jerusalem.¹¹⁰ When John was cast into prison, and the work of declaring the glad tidings of the kingdom required a new company of preachers, we may believe that he, like his companions and friends, received a new call to a more constant discipleship.¹¹¹ When the Twelve were specially set apart for their office, he was numbered among them. The first three Gospels tell us nothing more of him individually. St. John, with his characteristic fullness of personal reminiscences, records a few significant utterances. When the Galilean crowds had halted on their way to Jerusalem to hear the preaching of Jesus,¹¹² and were faint with hunger, it was to Philip that the question was put, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" "And this he said," St. John adds, "to prove him, for he himself knew what he would do." The answer, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not suffi-

¹⁰⁷ John i. 43.—¹⁰⁸ Comp. John xxi. 2.—¹⁰⁹ Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 14.—¹¹⁰ John ii.—¹¹¹ Matt. iv. 18-22.—¹¹² John vi. 5-9.

cient for them that every one may take a little," shows how little he was prepared for the work of divine power that followed. It is noticeable that here, as in John i., he appears in close connection with Andrew.

Another incident is brought before us in John xii. 20–22. Among the pilgrims who had come to keep the Passover at Jerusalem, were some Gentile proselytes (Hellenes) who had heard of Jesus, and desired to see him. The Greek name of Philip may have attracted them. The zealous love which he had shown in the case of Nathanael may have made him prompt to offer himself as their guide. But it is characteristic of him that he does not take them at once to the presence of his Master. "Philip cometh and telleth Andrew, and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus." The friend and fellow-townsmen to whom probably he owed his own introduction to Jesus of Nazareth is to introduce these strangers also.

There is a connection not difficult to be traced between this fact and that which follows on the last recurrence of Philip's name in the history of the Gospels. The desire to see Jesus gave occasion to the utterance of words in which the Lord spoke more distinctly than ever of the presence of his Father with him, and to the voice from heaven which manifested the Father's will.¹¹³ The words appear to have sunk into the heart of at least one of the disciples, and he brooded over them. The strong cravings of a passionate but unenlightened faith led him to feel that one thing was yet wanting. They heard their Lord speak of his Father and of their Father. He was going to his Father's house. They were to follow him there. But why should they not have even now a vision of the Divine glory? It was part of the child-like simplicity of Philip's nature that no reserve should hinder the expression of the craving, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us."¹¹⁴ And the answer to that desire belonged also specially to him. He had all along been eager to lead others to see Jesus. He had been with him, looking on him from the very commencement of his ministry, and yet he had not known him. He had thought of the glory of the Father as consisting in something else than the Truth, Righteousness, Love that he had witnessed in the Son. "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. How sayest thou, Show us the Father?" No other fact connected with the name of Philip is recorded in the Gospels. The close relation in which we have seen him

¹¹³ John xii. 28.

¹¹⁴ John xiv. 8.

standing to the sons of Zebedee and Nathanael might lead us to think of him as one of the two unnamed disciples in the list of fishermen of the Sea of Tiberias who meet us in John xxi. He is among the company of disciples at Jerusalem after the Ascension,¹¹⁵ and on the day of Pentecost.

After this all is uncertain and apocryphal. He is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria as having had a wife and children, and as having sanctioned the marriage of his daughters instead of binding them to vows of chastity,¹¹⁶ and is included in the list of those who had borne witness of Christ in their lives, but had not died what was commonly looked on as a martyr's death.¹¹⁷ Polycrates,¹¹⁸ bishop of Ephesus, speaks of him as having fallen asleep in the Phrygian Hierapolis, as having had two daughters who had grown old unmarried, and a third, with special gifts of inspiration, who had died at Ephesus. There seems, however, in this mention of the daughters of Philip, to be some confusion between the Apostle and the Evangelist. The apocryphal "*Acta Philippi*" are utterly wild and fantastic, and if there is any grain of truth in them, it is probably the bare fact that the Apostle or the Evangelist labored in Phrygia, and died at Hierapolis.

§ 14. BARTHOLOMEW is a patronymic, the *son of Talmai*.¹¹⁹ His *own* name nowhere appears in the three first Gospels. It has been not improbably conjectured that he is identical with Nathanael.¹²⁰ Nathanael there appears to have been first brought to Jesus by Philip; and in the three first catalogues of the Apostles (cited above) Bartholomew and Philip appear together. It is difficult also to imagine, from the place assigned to Nathanael in John xxi. 2, that he can have been other than an Apostle. If this may be assumed, he was born at Cana of Galilee: and he is said to have preached the Gospel in India,¹²¹ meaning thereby, probably, Arabia Felix, which was sometimes called India by the ancients.¹²² Some allot Armenia to him as his mission-field, and report him to have been there flayed alive and then crucified with his head downward.¹²³

§ 15. MATTHEW, the Apostle and Evangelist, is the same as Levi,¹²⁴ the son of a certain Alphæus.¹²⁵ His call to be an

¹¹⁵ Acts i. 13.

¹¹⁶ Strom. iii. 52; Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 30.

¹¹⁷ Strom. iv. 73.

¹¹⁸ Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 31.

¹¹⁹ Compare the LXX. *Θολμαί*, *Θολμαῖ* Josh. xv. 14, 2 K. xiii. 37, and *Θολομαῖος*, Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 1, § 1

¹²⁰ John i. 45 ff.

¹²¹ Euseb. *H. E.* v. 10; Jerome, *Vir. Illust.* 36.

¹²² Mosheim, *De Rebus Christ. ante Constant. M. Commentarii*, p. 206.

¹²³ Asseman. *Bibl. Or.* iii. 2, 20.

¹²⁴ Luke v. 27-29. ¹²⁵ Mark ii. 14

Apostle is related by all three Evangelists in the same words, except that Matthew gives the former, and Mark and Luke the latter name.¹²⁶ If there were two publicans, both called solemnly in the same form at the same place, Capernaum, then one of them became an Apostle, and the other was heard of no more, nor Levi is not mentioned again after the feast which he made in our Lord's honor.¹²⁷ This is most unlikely. Euthymius and many other commentators of note identify Alphæus the father of Matthew with Alphæus the father of James the Less. Against this is to be set the fact that in the lists of Apostles, Matthew and James the Less are never mentioned together, like other pairs of brothers in the Apostolic body. It may be, as in other cases, that the name Levi was replaced by the name Matthew at the time of the call. The names Matthæus and Matthias are probably both contractions of Mattathias,¹²⁸ a common Jewish name after the exile; but the true derivation is not certain. He belonged to the sordid class of *portitores*, the collectors under the *publicani*, who, as a rule, were worthy of the hatred with which the Jews regarded them.¹²⁹ The readiness, however, with which Matthew obeyed the call of Jesus seems to show that his heart was still open to religious impressions. His conversion was attended by a great awakening of the outcast classes of the Jews.¹³⁰ Matthew, in his Gospel, does not omit the title of infamy which had belonged to him, but neither of the other Evangelists speaks of "Matthew the publican." Of the exact share which fell to him in preaching the Gospel nothing whatever is told us in the New Testament, and other sources of information we can not trust.

Eusebius¹³¹ mentions that after our Lord's ascension Matthew preached in Judæa (some add for fifteen years), and then went to foreign nations. To the lot of Matthew it fell to visit Ethiopia, says Socrates Scholasticus.¹³² Ambrose says that God opened to him the country of the Persians;¹³³ Isidore, the Macedonians;¹³⁴ and others, the Parthians, the Medes, the Persians of the Euphrates: but nothing whatever is really known. Heracleon, the disciple of Valentinus (cited by Clemens Alexandrinus) describes him as dying a natural death, which Clement, Origen, and Tertullian seem to accept: the tradition that he died a martyr came in afterward.

¹²⁶ Matt. ix. 9; Mark ii. 14; Luke v. 27.

¹²⁷ Luke v. 29.

¹²⁸ i. e., "Gift of Jehovah" = Θεόδωτος, Θεόδοτος.

¹³⁰ Matt. ix. 9, 10.—¹³¹ *H. E.* iii. 24.

¹³² *H. E.* i. 19; *Ruff. H. E.* x. 9.

¹³³ *In Ps.* 45.

¹³⁴ Isidore *Hisp. de Sanet.* 77

¹²⁹ See chap. vii., *Notes and Illustrations* (A).

§ 16. All that we know of THOMAS ¹³⁶ is derived from the Gospel of St. John; and this amounts to three traits, which, however, so exactly agree together, that, slight as they are, they place his character before us with a precision which belongs to no other of the twelve Apostles, except Peter, John, and Judas Iscariot. This character is that of a man slow to believe, seeing all the difficulties of a case, subject to despondency, viewing things on the darker side, and yet full of ardent love for his Master.

The first trait is his speech when our Lord determined to face the dangers that awaited him in Judæa on his journey to Bethany. Thomas said to his fellow-disciples, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." ¹³⁶ He entertained no hope of his escape—he looked on the journey as leading to total ruin; but he determined to share the peril. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him."

The second was his speech during the Last Supper: "Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?" ¹³⁷ It was the prosaic, incredulous doubt as to moving a step in the unseen future, and yet an eager inquiry to know how this step was to be taken.

The third was after the Resurrection. He was absent—possibly by accident, perhaps characteristically—from the first assembly when Jesus appeared. The others told him what they had seen. He broke forth into an exclamation, the terms of which convey to us at once the vehemence of his doubt, and at the same time the vivid picture that his mind retained of his Master's form as he had last seen him lifeless on the cross. "Except I see on his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not, I can not believe." ¹³⁸

On the eighth day he was with them at their gathering, perhaps in expectation of a recurrence of the visit of the previous week; and Jesus stood among them. He uttered the same salutation, "Peace be unto you;" and then turning to

¹³⁶ According to Eusebius (*H. E.* i. 13) his real name was Judas. This may have been a mere confusion with Thaddæus, who is mentioned in the extract. But it may also be that Thomas was a surname. The word *Thoma* means "a twin;" and so it is translated in John xi. 16, xxi. 2, *ὁ δίδυμος*. Out of this name has grown the tradition that he had a twin-sister, Lydia (*Patres Apost.* p. 272), or that he was a twin-brother of our Lord (Thilo, *Acta Thomæ*, p. 94); which last, again, would confirm his identification with Judas (comp. Matt. xiii. 55). He is said to have been born at Antioch (*Patres Apost.* pp. 272, 512).

¹³⁸ John xi. 16.

¹³⁷ John xiv. 5. ¹³⁸ John xx. 25.

Thomas, as if this had been the special object of his appearance, uttered the words which convey as strongly the sense of condemnation and tender reproof, as those of Thomas had shown the sense of hesitation and doubt. "Bring thy finger hither [ἵδε—as if himself pointing to his wounds] and see my hands; and bring thy hand and thrust it in my side; and do not become (μὴ γίνῃς) unbelieving (ἄπιστος), but believing (πιστός)."

The effect¹³⁹ on Thomas is immediate. The conviction produced by the removal of his doubt became deeper and stronger than that of any of the other Apostles. The words in which he expressed his belief contain a far higher assertion of his Master's divine nature than can be traced in any other expression used by Apostolic lips, "My Lord and my God." And the word "my" gives it a personal application to himself. The answer of our Lord sums up the moral of the whole narrative: "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen me, and yet have believed."¹⁴⁰ By this incident, therefore, Thomas, "the Doubting Apostle," is raised at once to the Theologian in the original sense of the word. It is this feature of his character which has been caught in later ages, when for the first time its peculiar lesson became apparent. In the famous statue of him by Thorwaldsen in the church at Copenhagen, he stands, the thoughtful, meditative sceptic, with the rule in his hand for the due measuring of evidence and argument. In the New Testament we hear of Thomas only twice again, once on the Sea of Galilee with the seven disciples, where he is ranked next after Peter,¹⁴¹ and again in the assemblage of the Apostles after the Ascension.¹⁴²

The earlier traditions, as believed in the fourth century,¹⁴³ represent him as preaching in Parthia or Persia, and as finally buried at Edessa.¹⁴⁴ Chrysostom mentions his grave at Edessa, as being one of the four genuine tombs of Apostles; the other three being those of Peter, Paul and John.¹⁴⁵ With his burial at Edessa agrees the story of his sending Thaddæus to Abgarus with our Lord's letter.¹⁴⁶

The later traditions carry him further East, and ascribe to him the foundation of the Christian Church in Malabar, which still goes by the name of "the Christians of St. Thom-

¹³⁹ It is useless to speculate whether he obeyed our Lord's invitation to examine the wounds. The impression is that he did not.

¹⁴⁰ John xx. 29.

¹⁴¹ John xxi. 2.

¹⁴² Acts i. 13.

¹⁴³ Eus. *H. E.* i. 13, iii. 1; Socrat. *H. E.* i. 19.

¹⁴⁴ Socr. *H. E.* iv. 18.

¹⁴⁵ *Hom. in Heb.* 26.

¹⁴⁶ Euseb. *H. E.* i. 18.

as ;” and his tomb is shown in the neighborhood. This, however, is now usually regarded as arising from a confusion with a later Thomas, a missionary from the Nestorians. His martyrdom (whether in Persia or India) is said to have been effected by a lance.¹⁴⁷

§ 17. To these twelve Apostles two more were added specially for the mission to the Gentiles, for we have seen that BARNABAS, as well as Paul, is expressly designated by that title. The word *Barnabas* is an appellative—signifying the “son of prophecy” or “exhortation,” rather than of “consolation”—given by the Apostles to JOSEPH, a Levite of the island of Cyprus.¹⁴⁸ We have already seen his Christian devotedness, as contrasted with the self-seeking of Ananias ; how he justified his title by his ministry at Antioch ; how he introduced Paul to the Apostles after his conversion ; how he sought him out at Tarsus, labored with him at Antioch, went up with him twice to Jerusalem, and shared his first missionary journey ; and how, on the proposal of the second, the fellow-laborers were severed by their dispute about John Mark.

If we may judge from the hint furnished by the fact that Paul was commended by the brethren to the grace of God, it would seem that Barnabas was in the wrong. He took Mark, and sailed to Cyprus, his native island. And here the Scripture notices of him cease : those found in Gal. ii. 1, 9, 13, belong to an earlier period. From 1 Cor. ix. 6 we infer that Barnabas was a married man ; and from Gal. (*l. c.*), and the circumstances of the dispute with Paul, his character seems not to have possessed that thoroughness of purpose and determination which was found in the great Apostle. As to his further labors and death, traditions differ. Some say that he went to Milan, and became first bishop of the Church there : the Clementine Homilies make him to have been a disciple of our Lord himself, and to have preached in Rome and Alexandria, and converted Clement of Rome : the Clementine Recognitions say that he preached in Rome even during the life-time of our Lord. There is extant an apocryphal work, probably of the fifth century, *Acta et Passio Barnabæ in Cypro*, which relates his second missionary journey to Cyprus, and his death by martyrdom there ; and a still later encomium of Barnabas, by a Cyprian monk Alexander, which makes him to have been brought up with St. Paul under

¹⁴⁷ An apocryphal “Gospel of Thomas” (chiefly relating to the Infancy of Christ) is published in Tischendorf’s *Evangelium Apocrypha* ; the Apocryphal “Acts of Thomas” by Thilo (*Codex Apocryphus*).

¹⁴⁸ Acts iv. 36.

Gamaliel, and gives an account of the pretended finding of his body in the time of the Emperor Zeno (474–490). We have an Epistle in twenty-one chapters called by the name of Barnabas. Of this, the first four chapters and a half are extant only in a barbarous Latin version; the rest in the original Greek. Its authenticity has been defended by some great names; but it is very generally given up now, and the Epistle is believed to have been written early in the second century.

§ 18. In their office of laying the foundations of the Church, some of the Apostles used the pen as well as the tongue; and two of them, MATTHEW and JOHN, undertook the special function of placing on permanent record those facts concerning the life and death and resurrection of Christ, of which they were his own chosen witnesses. This would seem to be a distinctive part of the Apostolic office; nor is this view at variance with the fact that it was undertaken also by two others, who were not Apostles. For it may now be received as an established fact, that the Gospels of MARK and LUKE were written under the supervision of Peter and Paul. These two writers, therefore, may well claim a place next to the Apostles. But, in speaking of them as *Evangelists*, we must distinguish this use of the word from its proper New Testament signification, as describing a class of teachers next in rank to Apostles and Prophets, the *Evangelizers* of the world.¹⁴⁹ It was at a later age that the *writer of a Gospel* (εὐαγγέλιον), was called an *Evangelist* (εὐαγγελιστής) not only a matter of etymology, but the natural process of thought which is thus stated by Eusebius:—"Men do the work of Evangelists, leaving their homes to proclaim Christ, and deliver *the written Gospels* to those who were ignorant of the faith."¹⁵⁰ If the Gospel was a written book, and the office of the Evangelists was to read or distribute it, then the writers of such books were κατ' ἐξοχήν THE EVANGELISTS. It is thus, accordingly, that Eusebius speaks of them; and this meaning soon overshadowed the old one. Of the Gospels we shall speak presently;¹⁵¹ and frequent occasions have occurred to notice points in that personal history of Mark and Luke, which we have now to collect into one view.

(i.) MARK the Evangelist is probably the same as "JOHN whose surname was MARK."¹⁵² John was the Jewish name, and Mark, a name of frequent use among the Romans, was adopted afterward, and gradually superseded the other. The places in the New Testament enable us to trace the process

¹⁴⁹ Eph. iv. 11.

¹⁵⁰ Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 37.

¹⁵¹ See Appendix, p. 700, seq.

¹⁵² Acts xii. 12, 25

The John Mark of Acts xii. 12, 25, and the John of Acts xiii. 5, 13, becomes Mark only in Acts xv. 39, Col. iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 11, Philem. 24. The change of John to Mark is analogous to that of Saul to Paul; and we can not doubt that the disuse of the Jewish name in favor of the other is intentional, and has reference to the putting away of his former life, and his entrance upon a new ministry. No inconsistency arises from the accounts of his ministering to two Apostles. Of his desertion of Paul we have already spoken.¹⁵³

John Mark was the son of a certain Mary, who dwelt at Jerusalem, and he was therefore probably born in that city.¹⁵⁴ He was the cousin of Barnabas.¹⁵⁵ It was to Mary's house, as to a familiar haunt, that Peter came after his deliverance from prison,¹⁵⁶ and there found "many gathered together praying;" and John Mark was probably converted by Peter from meeting him in his mother's house, for he speaks of "Marcus my son."¹⁵⁷ This natural link of connection between the two passages is broken by the supposition of two Marks, which is on all accounts improbable. The theory that he was one of the seventy disciples is without any warrant. Another theory, that an event of the night of our Lord's betrayal, related by Mark alone, is one that befell himself, must not be so promptly dismissed. "There followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him; and he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked."¹⁵⁸ The detail of facts is remarkably minute, the name only is wanting. The most probable view is that St. Mark suppressed his own name, while telling a story which he had the best means of knowing. Awakened out of sleep, or just preparing for it, in some house in the valley of Kedron, he comes out to see the seizure of the betrayed Teacher, known to him and in some degree beloved already. He is so deeply interested in his fate that he follows him even in his thin linen robe. His demeanor is such that some of the crowd are about to arrest him; then, "fear overcoming shame" (Bengel), he leaves his garment in their hands and flees. We can only say that if the name of Mark is supplied, the narrative receives its most probable explanation. John¹⁵⁹ introduces himself in this unobtrusive way, and perhaps Luke likewise.¹⁶⁰ Mary the moth-

¹⁵³ Acts xiii. 13. Chap. xv. § 10. in the A.V.), and thence extended to

¹⁵⁴ Acts xii. 12.

¹⁵⁵ Col. iv. 10, ἀνεψιός, properly
"first-cousin" (not "sister's son," as

¹⁵⁹ John i, 40, xix. 26.

any collateral blood relations.

¹⁵⁶ Acts xii. 12. ¹⁵⁷ 1 Pet. v. 13

¹⁵⁸ Mark xiv. 51, 52.

¹⁶⁰ Luke xxiv. 18.

er of Mark seems to have been a person of some means and influence, and her house a rallying-point for Christians in those dangerous days. Her son, already an inquirer, would soon become more. Anxious to work for Christ, he went with Paul and Barnabas as their "minister" on their return from Jerusalem, and on their first journey; but at Perga, as we have seen above, he turned back.¹⁶¹ On the second journey Paul would not accept him again as a companion, but Barnabas his kinsman was more indulgent; and thus he became the cause of the memorable "sharp contention" between them.¹⁶² Whatever was the cause of Mark's vacillation, it did not separate him forever from Paul, for we find him by the side of that Apostle in his first imprisonment at Rome.¹⁶³ In the former place a journey of Mark to Asia is contemplated. Somewhat later he is with Peter at Babylon.¹⁶⁴ Some consider Babylon to be a name here given to Rome in a mystical sense; surely without reason, since the date of a letter is not the place to look for a figure of speech. Of the causes of this visit to Babylon there is no evidence. It may be conjectured that he made the journey to Asia Minor, and thence went on to join Peter at Babylon.¹⁶⁵ Returning to proconsular Asia, he seems to have been with Timothy at Ephesus when Paul wrote to him during his second imprisonment, and Paul was anxious for his company and ministry at Rome.¹⁶⁶

When we pass beyond Scripture, we find the facts doubtful and even inconsistent. If Papias is to be trusted,¹⁶⁷ Mark never was a disciple of our Lord; which he probably infers from 1 Pet. v. 13. Epiphanius, on the other hand, willing to do honor to the Evangelist, adopts the tradition that he was one of the seventy-two disciples, who turned back from our Lord at the hard saying in John vi.¹⁶⁸ The same had been said of St. Luke. Nothing can be decided on this point. The relation of Mark to Peter is of great importance for our view of his Gospel. Ancient writers with one consent make the Evangelist the interpreter (*ἐρμηνευτής*) of the Apostle Peter.¹⁶⁹ Some explain this word to mean that the office of Mark was to translate into the Greek tongue the Aramaic

¹⁶¹ Acts xii. 25, xiii. 13.

¹⁶² Acts xv. 36-40.

¹⁶³ Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24.

¹⁶⁴ 1 Pet. v. 13.

¹⁶⁵ Comp. chap. xix. § 1.

¹⁶⁶ 2 Tim. iv. 11.

¹⁶⁸ *Contra. Hæc.* li. 6, p. 457, Dindorf's recent edition.

¹⁶⁹ Papias in Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39; Irenæus, *Hæc.* iii. 1, iii. 10, 6; Tertullian, *c. Marc.* iv. 5; Hieronymus, *ad Hedib.* ix., etc.

¹⁶⁷ Quoted in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 39.

discourses of the Apostle; while others adopt the more probable view, that Mark wrote a Gospel which conformed more exactly than the others to Peter's preaching, and thus "interpreted" it to the Church at large. The report that Mark was the companion of Peter at *Rome* is no doubt of great antiquity. Clement of Alexandria is quoted by Eusebius as giving it for "a tradition which he had received of the elders from the first."¹⁷⁰ But the force of this is invalidated by the suspicion that it rests on a misunderstanding of 1 Pet. v. 13, Babylon being wrongly taken for a typical name of Rome.¹⁷¹ Another tradition is, that Mark, sent on a mission to Egypt by Peter,¹⁷² founded the Church of Alexandria,¹⁷³ and having preached in various places¹⁷⁴ then returned to Alexandria, of which Church he was bishop, and there suffered a martyr's death.¹⁷⁵ But none of these later details rest on sound authority.

(ii.) The name LUKE (*Λουκᾶς*) is an abbreviated form of *Lucanus* or of *Lucilius*. It is not to be confounded with Lucius,¹⁷⁶ which belongs to a different person. The name of Luke occurs three times in the New Testament,¹⁷⁷ and doubtless in all three the third Evangelist is the person spoken of. To the Colossians he is described as "the beloved physician," probably because he had been known to them in that faculty. Timothy needs no additional mark for identification; to him the words are, "only Luke is with me." To Philemon, Luke sends his salutation in common with other "fellow-laborers" of St. Paul. As there is every reason to believe that the Luke of these passages is the author of the Acts of the Apostles, as well as of the Gospel which bears his name, it is natural to seek in the former book for some traces of that connection with St. Paul which these passages assume to exist; and although the name of St. Luke does not occur in the *Acts*, we have seen ample reason to believe that under the pronoun "we," several references to the Evangelist are to be added to the three places just quoted.

Combining the traditional element with the Scriptural, the uncertain with the certain, we are able to trace the following dim outline of the Evangelist's life. He was born at Antioch in Syria;¹⁷⁸ in what condition of life is uncertain. That he was taught the science of medicine does not prove that he

¹⁷⁰ Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 14; Clem. Alex. *Hyp.* 6.

¹⁷¹ Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 15; Hieron. *De Vir.* Ill. 8.

¹⁷² Epiphanius, *Hær.* li. 6, p. 457, Dindorf; Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 16.

¹⁷³ Hieron. *De Vir.* Ill. 8.

¹⁷⁴ Niceph. *H. E.* ii. 43.

¹⁷⁵ Niceph. *ibid.*, and Hieron. *De Vir.* Ill. 8.

¹⁷⁶ Acts xiii. 1; Rom. xvi. 21.

¹⁷⁷ Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 11; Philem. 24.

¹⁷⁸ Euseb. *Hist.* iii. 4

was of higher birth than the rest of the disciples; medicine in its earlier and ruder state was sometimes practiced even by a slave. The well-known tradition that Luke was also a painter, and of no mean skill, rests on the authority of Nicephorus,¹⁷⁹ and of other late writers; but none of them are of historical authority, and the Acts and Epistles are wholly silent upon a point so likely to be mentioned. He was not born a Jew, for he is not reckoned among them "of the circumcision" by St. Paul.¹⁸⁰ If this be not thought conclusive, nothing can be argued from the Greek idioms in his style, for he might be a Hellenist Jew; nor from the Gentile tendency of his Gospel, for this it would share with the inspired writings of St. Paul, a Pharisee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. The date of his conversion is uncertain. He was not indeed "an eye-witness and minister of the word from the beginning,"¹⁸¹ or he would have rested his claim as an Evangelist upon that ground. Still he may have been converted by the Lord himself, some time before His departure; and the statement of Epiphanius,¹⁸² and others, that he was one of the seventy disciples, has nothing very improbable in it; while that which Theophylact adopts (on Luke xxiv.), that he was one of the two who journeyed to Emmaus with the risen Redeemer, has found modern defenders. Tertullian assumes that the conversion of Luke is to be ascribed to Paul;¹⁸³ and the balance of probability is on this side.

The first ray of historical light falls on the Evangelist when he joins St. Paul at Troas, and shares his journey into Macedonia. The sudden transition to the first person plural in Acts xvi. 9, is most naturally explained, after all the objections that have been urged, by supposing that Luke, the writer of the Acts, formed one of St. Paul's company from this point. His conversion had taken place before, since he silently assumes his place among the great Apostle's followers without any hint that this was his first admission to the knowledge and ministry of Christ. He may have found his way to Troas to preach the Gospel, sent possibly by St. Paul himself. As far as Philippi, the Evangelist journeyed with the Apostle. The resumption of the third person on Paul's departure from that place¹⁸⁴ would show that Luke was now left behind. During the rest of St. Paul's second missionary journey we hear of

¹⁷⁹ *H. E.* ii. 43.

¹⁸⁰ *Comp. Col.* iv. 11 with ver. 14.

¹⁸¹ *Luke* i. 2.

¹⁸² *Cont. Her.* li. 11.

¹⁸³ *Lucas non apostolus, sed apos-*

tolicus; non magister, sed discipulus, utique magistro minor, certe tanto posterior quanto posterioris Apostoli sectator, Pauli sine dubio (*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 2).

Luke no more. But on the third journey the same indication reminds us that Luke is again of the company,¹⁸⁶ having joined it apparently at Philippi, where he had been left. With the Apostle he passed through Miletus, Tyre and Cæsarea to Jerusalem.¹⁸⁷ Between the two visits of Paul to Philippi seven years had elapsed (A.D. 51 to A.D. 58), which the Evangelist may have spent in Philippi and its neighborhood, preaching the Gospel.

There remains one passage which, if it refers to St. Luke, must belong to this period. "We have sent with him" (*i. e.*, Titus) "the brother whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches."¹⁸⁷ The subscription of the Epistle sets out that it was "written from Philippi, a city of Macedonia, by Titus and Lucas," and it is an old opinion that Luke was the companion of Titus, although he is not named in the body of the Epistle. If this be so, we are to suppose that during the "three months" of Paul's sojourn at Philippi¹⁸⁸ Luke was sent from that place to Corinth on this errand; and the words "whose praise is in the Gospel throughout all the churches," enable us to form an estimate of his activity during the interval in which he has not been otherwise mentioned. It is needless to add that the praise lay in the activity with which he preached the Gospel; and not, as Jerome understands the passage, in his being the author of a written Gospel.¹⁸⁹ The narrative warrants the inference, that Luke was with Paul during his two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea; and this is the most probable time for the composition of his Gospel.

He again appears in the company of Paul in the memorable voyage to Rome.¹⁹⁰ He remained at his side during his imprisonment;¹⁹¹ and, assuming that the second Epistle to Timothy was written during the second imprisonment, the testimony of that Epistle (iv. 11) shows that he continued faithful to the Apostle to the end of his afflictions.

After the death of St. Paul, the acts of his faithful companion are hopelessly obscure to us.¹⁹² It is as perhaps the Evangelist wished it to be: we only know him while he stands by the side of his beloved Paul: when the master departs, the history of the follower becomes confusion and fable. As to the age and death of the Evangelist, there is the utmost uncertainty. It seems probable that he died in advanced life; but

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| ¹⁸⁴ Acts xvii. 1. | ¹⁸⁵ Acts xx. 5. | est in Evangelio per omnes ecclesias' " (<i>De Viris Ill.</i> c. 7). |
| ¹⁸⁶ Acts xx. 5, xxi. 18. | | |
| ¹⁸⁷ 2 Cor. viii. 18. | ¹⁸⁸ Acts xx. 3. | ¹⁹⁰ Acts xxvii. 1. See chap. xviii. |
| ¹⁸⁹ "Lucas . . . scripsit Evangelium de quo idem Paulus 'Misimus, inquit, cum illo fratrem, cujus laus | § 3. | ¹⁹¹ Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24. |
| | | ¹⁹² In a well-known passage of |

whether he suffered martyrdom or died a natural death; whether Bithynia or Achaia, or some other country, witnessed his end, it is impossible to determine amid contradictory voices. That he died a martyr, between A.D. 75 and A.D. 100, would seem to have the balance of suffrages in its favor. It is enough for us, so far as regards the Gospel of St. Luke, to know that the writer was the tried and constant friend of the Apostle Paul, who shared his labors, and was not driven from his side by danger.

§ 19. Next in order to the Apostles, in the sacred history, stand those *Seven Men of Good Report* who are commonly called DEACONS; and this class derives special celebrity from the martyrdom of STEPHEN, and the evangelizing labors of PHILIP. After what has been said of these two in the Apostolic history, it only remains to add some further notices of the latter. He was, like the rest of his colleagues, in all probability a Hellenist. His place in the confidence of the Church is shown by his standing in the list of the Seven next to Stephen; and we should expect the man who was thus worthy of being Stephen's companion and fellow-worker to go on with the work which he left unfinished, and to break through the barriers of national Judaism. Accordingly, foremost among those whom the persecution that ensued on the death of the first Deacon drove from Jerusalem, we find the second carrying the Gospel to the outcasts of Samaria and the proselyte of Ethiopia: and thus Philip became the precursor of St. Paul in his work, as Stephen had been in his teaching. It falls to his lot, rather than to that of an Apostle, to take the first step in the victory over Jewish prejudice, and in the expansion of the Church according to its Lord's command. For this we may perhaps find a deeper reason than the mere fact that the Apostles had not yet left Jerusalem. As the Samaritans had already shown themselves, on our Lord's first visit, more alive to spiritual views of the Messiah than the Jews, so would a Hellenist probably be better prepared than a Jew to satisfy their hopes. From Azotus, where he re-appeared after his miraculous separation from the Ethiopian eunuch, he made his way to Cæsarea, preaching in all the cities he passed through;¹⁹³ and we may be permitted to conjecture that his ministry at

Epiphanius (*Hæc.* li. 11, vol. ii. 464, in Dindorf's edition) we find that "receiving the commission to preach the Gospel, [Luke] preaches first in Dalmatia and Gallia, in Italy and Macedonia, but first in Gallia, as Paul himself says of some of his companions, in his epistle, '*Crescens in Gallia*;' for we are not to read '*in Galatia*,' as some mistakenly think, but '*in Gallia*.'" But there seems to be as little authority for this account of St. Luke's ministry as there is for the reading *Gallia* in 2 Tim. iv. 10.

Cæsarea was one of the causes that awakened the holy curiosity of Cornelius.

Whether the Seven to whom Philip belonged are rightly or not identified with the order of *Deacons*, these labors of his go far beyond what are described as their special functions, and entitle him, before any other who was not an Apostle, to the designation under which he re-appears in the Acts, as **PHILIP THE EVANGELIST**, though still described as "one of the Seven."¹⁹⁴ He is still residing at Cæsarea, which he had doubtless made the centre of his labors as an Evangelist in preaching the Gospel; and his four virgin daughters possess the gift of prophecy. He receives Paul and his company on their way to Jerusalem; and he is visited by prophets and elders from that city. At such a place as Cæsarea, the work of such a man must have helped to bridge over the ever-widening gap which threatened to separate the Jewish and Gentile Churches. One who had preached Christ to the hated Samaritan, the swarthy African, the despised Philistine, the men of all nations who passed through the sea-port of Palestine, was a fit host to welcome the arrival of the Apostle of the Gentiles. The house in which he and his daughters had lived was pointed out to travelers in the time of Jerome. He is said to have died Bishop of Tralles, in Lydia. In other traditions he is more or less confounded with Philip the Apostle.

The remaining Deacons are not again mentioned in the New Testament. **PROCHORUS** is said by tradition to have been consecrated by St. Peter Bishop of Nicomedia in Bithynia: **NICANOR** is placed among the seventy or seventy-two Disciples (a mere congeries of New Testament names) by the pseudo-Hippolytus, who adds that he died at the time of the martyrdom of Stephen: **TIMON** is also made one of the seventy-two and Bishop of Bostra, where he suffered martyrdom by fire: and **PARMENAS** is said to have been martyred at Philippi in the reign of Trajan.

The last of the Seven, **NICOLAS**, a proselyte of Antioch, has obtained a greater but more questionable celebrity; but there is no reason, except the similarity of name, for identifying Nicolas with the sect of Nicolaitans mentioned in Rev. ii. 6, 14, 15. It would seem from these passages that the Nicolaitans held that it was lawful "to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication," in opposition to the decree of the Church recorded in Acts xv. 20, 29. The Nicolaitans themselves, at least as early as the time of Irenæus, claimed the Deacon as their founder. Epiphanius, an inaccurate writer,

¹⁹³ Acts viii.

¹⁹⁴ Acts xxi. 8, 9.

relates some details of the life of Nicolas the Deacon, and describes him as gradually sinking into the grossest impurity, and becoming the originator of the Nicolaitans and other immoral sects. The same account is believed, at least to some extent, by Jerome and other writers in the fourth century; but it is irreconcilable with the character of Nicolas given by Clement of Alexandria, an earlier and more discriminating writer than Epiphanius. He states that Nicolas led a chaste life and brought up his children in purity; that on a certain occasion, having been sharply reproved by the Apostles as a jealous husband, he repelled the charge by offering to allow his wife to become the wife of any other person; and that he was in the habit of repeating a saying which is ascribed to the Apostle Matthias also,—that it is our duty to fight against the flesh and to abuse it. His words were perversely interpreted by the Nicolaitans as authority for their immoral practices. Theodoret, in his account of the sect, repeats the foregoing statement of Clement; and charges the Nicolaitans with false dealing in borrowing the name of the Deacon.

§ 20. Of the other fellow-workers of the Apostles it is needless to collect the Scriptural notices and the later traditions, which have their proper place in a *Dictionary of the Bible*. But the prominence of Timothy and Titus among the companions of St. Paul, as well as the peculiar nature of the work committed to them, seems to call for a summary notice of their lives.

TITUS claims the precedence in the order of the narrative, as also no doubt in age. He is not mentioned in the *Acts*,¹⁹⁶ and our materials for his biography must be drawn entirely from the notices of him in the *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, the *Epistle to the Galatians*, and the *Epistle to Titus* himself, combined with the *Second Epistle to Timothy*. Taking the passages in the Epistles in the chronological order of the events referred to, we turn first to Gal. ii. 1, 3. We conceive the journey mentioned here to be identical with that recorded in Acts xv., in which Paul and Barnabas went from Antioch to Jerusalem to the conference which was to decide the question of the necessity of circumcision to the Gentiles. Here we see Titus in close association with Paul and Barnabas at Antioch.¹⁹⁶ He goes with them to Jerusalem. He is

¹⁹⁶ The reading *Τίτου Ἰούδου* in Acts xviii. 7 is too doubtful to support any inference, and is only raised to importance by Wieseler in connection with a theory that needs artificial help.

The recent hypothesis of Mr. King (*Who was St. Titus?* Dublin, 1853), identifying him with Timothy, is certainly ingenious, but quite untenable.
¹⁹⁶ His birthplace may have been

in fact one of the *τινες ἄλλοι* of Acts xv. 2, who were deputed to accompany them from Antioch. His circumcision was either not insisted on at Jerusalem, or, if demanded, was firmly resisted. He is very emphatically spoken of as a Gentile, by which is most probably meant that both his parents were Gentiles. Here is a double contrast with Timothy, who was circumcised by St. Paul's own directions, and one of whose parents was Jewish.¹⁹⁷ Titus would seem, on the occasion of the council, to have been specially a representative of the Church of the uncircumcision.

It is to our purpose to remark that, in the passage cited above, Titus is so mentioned as apparently to imply that he had become personally known to the Galatian Christians. This again, we combine with two other circumstances, namely, that the Epistle to the Galatians and the Second Epistle to the Corinthians were probably written within a few months of each other, and both during the same journey. From the latter of these two Epistles we obtain fuller notices of Titus in connection with St. Paul.

After leaving Galatia,¹⁹⁸ and spending a long time at Ephesus,¹⁹⁹ the Apostle proceeded to Macedonia by way of Troas. Here he expected to meet Titus,²⁰⁰ who had been sent on a mission to Corinth. In this hope he was disappointed, but in Macedonia Titus joined him.²⁰¹ Here we begin to see not only the above-mentioned fact of the mission of this disciple to Corinth, and the strong personal affection which subsisted between him and St. Paul, but also some part of the purport of the mission itself, which has been fully explained in the history.²⁰² But if we proceed further, we discern another part of the mission with which he was entrusted. This had reference to the collection, at that time in progress, for the poor Christians of Judæa. Thus we are prepared for what the Apostle now proceeds to do after his encouraging conversations with Titus regarding the Corinthian Church. He sends him back from Macedonia to Corinth, in company with two other trustworthy Christians, Trophimus and Tychicus (or, as some think, Luke), bearing the Second Epistle, and with an earnest request that he would see to the completion of the collection, which he had zealously promoted on his late visit.²⁰³

All that has preceded is drawn from direct statements in

here; but this is quite uncertain. The name, which is Roman, proves nothing.

¹⁹⁷ Acts xvi. 1, 3; 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 15.

¹⁹⁸ Acts xviii. 23.

¹⁹⁹ Acts xix. 1-xx. 1.

²⁰⁰ 2 Cor. ii. 13.

²⁰¹ 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7, 13-15.

²⁰² Chap. xviii. §§ 11, 12.

²⁰³ 2 Cor. viii. 6, 17.

the Epistles; but by indirect though fair inference we can arrive at something further, which gives coherence to the rest, with additional elucidations of the close connection of Titus with St. Paul and the Corinthian Church. It has generally been considered doubtful who the Brethren were²⁰⁴ that took the First Epistle to Corinth; but there can be little doubt that the messengers who took that first letter were Titus and his companion, whoever that might be, who is mentioned with him in the second letter.

A considerable interval now elapses before we come upon the next notices of this disciple. St. Paul's first imprisonment is concluded, and his last trial is impending. In the interval between the two, he and Titus were together in Crete.²⁰⁵ We see Titus remaining in the island when St. Paul left it, and receiving there a letter written to him by the Apostle. From this letter we gather the following biographical details:—In the first place we learn that he was originally converted through St. Paul's instrumentality.²⁰⁶ Next we learn the various particulars of the responsible duties which he had to discharge in Crete. He is to complete what St. Paul had been obliged to leave unfinished, and he is to organize the Church throughout the island by appointing presbyters in every city. Instructions are given as to the suitable character of such presbyters, and we learn further that we have here the repetition of instructions previously furnished by word of mouth. Next he is to control and bridle the restless and mischievous Judaizers, and he is to be peremptory in so doing. Injunctions in the same spirit are reiterated.²⁰⁷ He is to urge the duties of a decorous and Christian life upon the women,²⁰⁸ some of whom possibly had something of an official character. He is to be watchful over his own conduct; he is to impress upon the slaves the peculiar duties of their position; he is to check all social and political turbulence and also all wild theological speculations and to exercise discipline on the heretical.²⁰⁹ When we consider all these particulars of his duties, we see not only the confidence reposed in him by the Apostle, but the need there was of determination and strength of purpose, and therefore the probability that this was his character; and all this is enhanced if we bear in mind his isolated and unsupported position in Crete, and the lawless and immoral character of the Cretans themselves, as testified by their own writers.²¹⁰

²⁰⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 11, 12.²⁰⁵ Tit. i. 5.²⁰⁶ Tit. i. 4.²⁰⁷ Tit. ii. 1, 15, iii. 8.²⁰⁸ Tit. ii. 3, 5.²⁰⁹ Tit. iii. 1, 9, 10.²¹⁰ Tit. i. 12, 13.

The notices which remain are more strictly personal. Titus is to look for the arrival in Crete of Artemas and Tychicus,²¹¹ and then he is to hasten to join St. Paul at Nicopolis, where the Apostle is proposing to pass the winter. Zenas and Apollos are in Crete, or expected there; for Titus is to send them on their journey and supply them with whatever they need for it.²¹² It is observable that Titus and Apollos are brought into juxtaposition here, as they were before in the discussion of the mission from Ephesus to Corinth.

We may observe here that there would be great difficulty in inserting the visits to Crete and Nicopolis in any of the journeys recorded in the Acts, to say nothing of the other objections to giving the Epistle any date anterior to the voyage to Rome. On the other hand, there is no difficulty in arranging these circumstances, if we suppose St. Paul to have traveled and written after being liberated from Rome, while thus we gain the further advantage of an explanation of what Paley has well called the affinity of this Epistle and the first to Timothy. Whether Titus did join the Apostle at Nicopolis we can not tell. But we naturally connect the mention of this place with what St. Paul wrote at no great interval of time afterward, in the last of the Pastoral Epistles;²¹³ for Dalmatia lay to the north of Nicopolis, at no great distance from it. From the form of the whole sentence, it seems probable that this disciple had been with St. Paul in Rome during his final imprisonment: but this can not be asserted confidently. The touching words of the Apostle in this passage might seem to imply some reproach, and we might draw from them the conclusion that Titus became a second Demas: but on the whole this seems a harsh and unnecessary judgment.

Whatever else remains is legendary, though it may contain elements of truth. Titus is connected by tradition with Dalmatia, and he is said to have been an object of much reverence in that region. This, however, may simply be a result of the passage quoted immediately above: and it is observable that of all the churches in modern Dalmatia not one is dedicated to him. The traditional connection of Titus with Crete is much more specific and constant, though here again we can not be certain of the facts. He is said to have been permanent bishop in the island, and to have died there at an advanced age. The modern capital, *Candia*, appears to claim the honor of being his burial-place. In the apocryphal fragment, *De Vita et Actis Titi*, by the lawyer Zenas, Titus is called Bishop of Gortyna: and on the old site of Gortyna is

²¹¹ Tit. iii. 12. ²¹² Tit. iii. 13. ²¹³ Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν, 2 Tim. iv. 10

a ruined church, of ancient and solid masonry, which bears the name of St. Titus, and where service is occasionally celebrated by priests from the neighboring hamlet of *Metropolis*. The cathedral of *Megalo-Castron*, in the north of the island, is also dedicated to this saint. Lastly, the name of Titus was the watch-word of the Cretans when they were invaded by the Venetians: and the Venetians themselves, after their conquest of the island, adopted him to some of the honors of a patron saint.

Of TIMOTHEUS,²⁴ or, as his name is expressed in the familiar English abbreviation, TIMOTHY, we have had occasion to speak more fully in narrating the life of the Apostle Paul. He was born at Lystra, in Lycaonia, the son of one of those mixed marriages between a Gentile father and a Jewish mother, which, though condemned by stricter Jewish opinion, and placing their offspring on all but the lowest step in the Jewish scale of precedence, were yet not uncommon in the later periods of Jewish history. The children of such marriages were known as *Mamzerim* (bastards), and stood just above the *Nethinim*. But the reverence of the Jews for their religion came in to redeem the disgrace: a bastard who was a wise student of the Law was, in theory, above an ignorant high-priest: and so the knowledge of the Scriptures, which Timothy owed to the care of his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice, may have helped to overcome the natural prejudice of his bigoted Jewish neighbors. Of the fruit of that pious education;—how it prepared Timothy to receive, while still a boy, the Gospel brought by Paul to his native city; and how, after gaining honor among the brethren at Lystra, Iconium, and even Antioch, he was chosen by Paul, on his second visit to Lycaonia, to share that fellowship of labor and of love which only ceased with the Apostle's death;—of his circumcision and ordination;—and of his part in Paul's work, till he was called to comfort his last hours and to witness his martyrdom at Rome;—we have spoken in former chapters. Their companionship begins with the second missionary journey, when Timothy may be regarded as supplying the void caused by the difference with Barnabas. If Barnabas had been to Paul as the brother and friend of early days, he had now found one whom he could claim as his

²⁴ Τιμόθεος, i. e., *honoring God*, or *honored of God*, a Greek translation of a Hebrew name, common in the Maccabæan period. It is also a pure Greek name, well known in classical history and literature. Our translators have retained the full Greek form in every case except 2 Cor. i. 1, Philem. 1, Heb. xiii. 23, and the two Epistles to Timothy.

own true son by a spiritual parentage.²¹⁵ That Timothy had now (A.D. 49 or 53) only just reached manhood, is evident from St. Paul's addressing him, in the First Epistle, as still young. Following Paul through Asia Minor into Europe, he came to Philippi; and though his tender youth was spared the sufferings of Paul and Silas, the Apostle calls the Philippians to witness how zealously he shared their work:—"Ye know the proof of him, that as a son with his father, he hath served with me in the Gospel."^{215b} His name does not appear in the account of St. Paul's work at Thessalonica, and it is possible that he remained some time at Philippi, and then acted as the messenger by whom the members of that Church sent what they were able to give for the Apostle's wants.²¹⁶ He appears, however, at Berea, and remains there when Paul and Silas are obliged to leave,²¹⁷ going on afterward to join his master at Athens.²¹⁸ From Athens he is sent back to Thessalonica, as having special gifts for comforting and teaching. He returns from Thessalonica, not to Athens but to Corinth, and his name appears united with St. Paul's in the opening words of both the letters written from that city to the Thessalonians.²¹⁹ Here also he was apparently active as an Evangelist,²²⁰ and on him, probably, with some exceptions, devolved the duty of baptizing the new converts.²²¹

Of the next five years of his life we have no record, and we can infer nothing beyond a continuance of his active service as St. Paul's companion. When we next meet with him, it is as being sent on in advance, when the Apostle was contemplating the long journey which was to include Macedonia, Achaia, Jerusalem and Rome.²²² He was sent to "bring the churches into remembrance of the ways" of the Apostle.²²³ We trace in the words of the "father" an anxious desire to guard the son from the perils which, to his eager but sensitive temperament, would be most trying.²²⁴ His route would take him through the churches which he had been instrumental in founding, and this would give him scope for exercising the gifts which were afterward to be displayed in a still more responsible office. It is probable, from the passages already referred to, that, after accomplishing the special work assigned to him, he returned by the same route and met St. Paul according to a previous arrangement,²²⁵ and was

²¹⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 17; 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2.

^{215b} Phil. ii. 22. ²¹⁶ Phil. iv. 15.

²¹⁷ Acts xvii. 14. ²¹⁸ 1 Thess. iii. 2.

²¹⁹ 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1.

²²⁰ 2 Cor. i. 19. ²²¹ 1 Cor. i. 14.

²²² Acts xix. 22.

²²³ 1 Cor. iv. 17.

²²⁴ 1 Cor. xvi. 10.

²²⁵ 1 Cor. xvi. 11.

thus with him when the Second Epistle was written to the Church of Corinth.²²⁶ He returns with the Apostle to that city, and joins in messages of greeting to the disciples whom he had known personally at Corinth, and who had since found their way to Rome.²²⁷ He forms one of the company of friends who go with St. Paul to Philippi and then sail by themselves, waiting for his arrival by a different ship.²²⁸ Whether he continued his journey to Jerusalem, and what became of him during St. Paul's two years' imprisonment and voyage, are points on which we must remain uncertain. He must have joined Paul, however, apparently soon after his arrival in Rome, and was with him when the Epistles to the Philippians, to the Colossians, and to Philemon were written.²²⁹

From the two Epistles addressed to him, we are able to put together a few notices as to his later life. It follows from 1 Tim. i. 3 that he and his master, after the release of the latter from his imprisonment, revisited the proconsular Asia, that the Apostle then continued his journey to Macedonia, while the disciple remained at Ephesus. We have already had occasion to describe his work there as portrayed in St. Paul's First Epistle to him. In the Second Epistle the Apostle's deep personal feeling utters itself yet more fully. The friendship of fifteen years was drawing to a close, and all memories connected with it throng upon the mind of the old man, now ready to be offered, the blameless youth,²³⁰ the holy household, the solemn ordination, the tears at parting.²³¹ The last recorded words of the Apostle express the earnest hope, repeated yet more earnestly, that he might see him once again.²³² Timothy is to come before winter, to bring with him the cloak for which in that winter there would be need.²³³ Of the spirit in which this urgent invitation was sent we have already spoken. We may hazard the conjecture that Timothy reached Paul in time, and that the last hours of the teacher were soothed by the presence of the disciple whom he loved so truly. He continues, according to the old traditions, to act as bishop of Ephesus,²³⁴ and dies a martyr's death under Domitian or Nerva.²³⁵ The great Festival of Artemis led him to protest against the license and frenzy which accompanied it. The mob were roused to fury, and put him to death with clubs.

²²⁶ 2 Cor. i. 1.²²⁷ Rom. xvi. 21.²²⁸ Acts xx. 3, 6.²²⁹ Phil. i. 1, ii. 19; Col. i. 1; Philem. 1.²³⁰ 2 Tim. iii. 15.²³¹ 2 Tim. i. 4-6.²³² 2 Tim. iv. 9, 12.²³³ 2 Tim. iv. 13.²³⁴ Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 14.²³⁵ Niceph. *H. E.* iii. 11.

APPENDIX I.

THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

§ 1. THE NEW TESTAMENT the standard of the Christian faith—Its relation to the Old Testament. § 2. Language of the New Testament, Greek—Reason of this. § 3. History of the Canon of the New Testament. § 4. Contents and arrangement of the New Testament. § 5. The *Four Gospels*—MATTHEW. § 6. MARK. § 7. LUKE. § 8. JOHN. § 9. The ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. § 10. The *Fourteen Epistles of St. Paul*—their order—ROMANS: i. and ii. CORINTHIANS: GALATIANS: EPHESIANS: PHILIPPIANS: COLOSSIANS: i. and ii. THESSALONIANS: i. and ii. TIMOTHY: TITUS: PHILEMON: EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. § 11. The *Catholic Epistles*—JAMES. § 12. i. and ii. PETER. § 13. JOHN, Epistles i. ii., iii. § 14. Epistle of JUDE. § 15. REVELATION OF ST. JOHN THE DIVINE.

§ 1. THE very title of the NEW TESTAMENT, or rather the NEW COVENANT, indicates its relation to the Old. The principle of that relation is expressed in our Lord's own words: "Think not that I am come to destroy the *Law and the Prophets*: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill." And as, at every stage of his earthly course, to the very time of his ascension, he appealed to the *written* standards of Jewish faith, from which also his Apostles argued, in all their preachings, that he was the Christ; so they, in their turn, provided a permanent *written* standard of Christian truth. Their own witness is most emphatic to this their purpose, and to the aid of the Holy Spirit in its accomplishment. St. Luke's preface to his Gospel, which he writes to Theophilus, "that he might know the certainty of those things in which he was instructed:"¹ St. John's declaration, "These things are *written in this book*, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name,"² followed by the attestation, "This is the disciple that testifieth of these things and *wrote* these things, and we know that his testimony is true:" St. Paul's frequent allusions to the authority of his Epistles: St. Peter's testimony, placing those Epistles on a level with *the other Scriptures*: these, to say nothing of innumerable allusions to the *Scriptures* as the standard of faith, are alone sufficient proofs of the principle, that the Christian Covenant, like the Jewish, was to be embodied in a Book, a collection of writings in which, as of old, "Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

§ 2. That *universal* character, in which the Christian Covenant differs from the Jewish, is seen in the very *language* in which each is expressed. The Hebrew was the peculiar dialect of the chosen race, to whom the ancient oracles were committed as a deposit: the *Greek* became, by the conquests of Alexander, the universal language of the civilized world. And as that world was reduced to one Empire, in which Judæa herself was the last province incorporated, that so the preachers of the Gospel might have free

¹ Luke i. 3, 4.

² John xx. 30, 31.

³ John xxi. 24.

course, so did a universal language give them a free audience; and the books which they wrote in Greek could be read from the Atlantic and Atlas to the Euphrates and Caucasus. Even if two books of the New Testament—the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews—were originally written for Jews in their own language, they form not even an exception to the statement; for the advocates of their Hebrew origin admit an equally, or almost equally, original Greek version.

But the Greek of the New Testament is a peculiar form of the Hellenic tongue, and requires distinct study. One of the most fruitful sources of error in the interpretation of the New Testament is the attempt to read it by the sole light of classical Greek.⁴

§ 3. The New Testament, like the Old, is not merely a collection of books, each preferring an independent claim to divine authority. As *A Book*, one united whole, it claims to be the *CANON*, or *rule*, of Christian faith. The complete Canon of the New Testament, as commonly received at present, was ratified at the third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), and from that time it was accepted throughout the Latin Church, though occasional doubts as to the Epistle to the Hebrews still remained.

§ 4. The New Testament consists of 27 books, which may be thus classified:

I. The FIVE HISTORICAL BOOKS; namely, the *Four Gospels*, and the *Acts of the Apostles*.

II. The FOURTEEN EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL; namely, *Ten* addressed to *eight Churches*, and *Four* to *three individuals*—Philemon, Timothy, and Titus.

III. The SEVEN CATHOLIC OR GENERAL EPISTLES; the Second and Third of John, though addressed to individuals, being placed as appendices to the First.

IV. The REVELATION OF ST. JOHN, though in the form of an Epistle to the Seven Churches of Asia, is rightly placed in a class by itself, as the one great prophetic book of the New Testament.

The *order* of the Books varies in ancient MSS. In all, the *Gospels* and *Acts* stand first, and the *Revelation* last; but in the most ancient texts the *General Epistles* precede the Pauline, and in some the *Epistle to the Hebrews* stands between the *Galatians* and *Ephesians*.

Much that might have been said of the several books has been anticipated in the History. What remains to be added relates chiefly to their genuineness and other points of criticism.

I. THE FIVE HISTORICAL BOOKS.

§ 5. The *Four Gospels* have already been treated of as a whole, especially in connection with the theories devised to account for their relations to one another.⁵ Some things have to be added about them as separate Books.

GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW.—(1.) *Language in which it was written*.—This Gospel was written by the Apostle, according to the testimony of all antiquity; but there has been much discussion as to the language in which it was originally composed. It must, however, be observed that every early

⁴ Some remarks on the language of the New Testament are given in *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. II. p. 531.

⁵ See Appendix to Book II., p. 860 foll.

writer who mentions that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel *at all* says that he wrote in Hebrew (that is in the Syro-Chaldaic) and in Palestine in the first century. Moreover every early writer that has come down to us uses the *Greek* of St. Matthew, and this with the definite recognition that it is a translation; hence we may be sure that the Greek copy belongs to the Apostolic age, having been thus authoritatively used from and up to that time. Thus the question is not the *authority* of the Greek translation, which comes from the time when the Churches enjoyed Apostolic guidance, but whether there was a Hebrew original from which it had been translated. The witnesses to the Hebrew original were men sufficiently competent to attest so simple a fact, especially seeing that they are relied on for what is far more important—that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel at all.

(2.) *Citations from Old Testament.*—A characteristic of this Gospel is its constant citations from the Old Testament. The number of passages in the Gospel which refer to it are about 65. In St. Luke they are 43. But in St. Matthew there are 43 *verbal citations* of the Old Testament; the number of these direct appeals to its authority in St. Luke is only about 19. This fact is very significant of the character and original purpose of the two narratives.⁶

(3.) *Genuineness of the First Two Chapters.*—The genuineness of the first two chapters of the Gospel has been questioned; but it is established on satisfactory grounds. (i.) All the Old MSS. and Versions contain these chapters; and they are quoted by the Fathers of the second and third centuries. Celsus also knew ch. ii. (ii.) Their contents would naturally form part of a Gospel intended primarily for the Jews. (iii.) The commencement of ch. iii. is dependent on ii. 23; and in iv. 13 there is a reference to ii. 23. (iv.) In constructions and expressions they are similar to the rest of the Gospel.

(4.) *Time and place at which the Gospel was written.*—The time when the Gospel was written is uncertain; but the testimony of old writers that Matthew's Gospel is the earliest must be taken into account;⁷ this would bring it before A.D. 58-60, the supposed date of St. Luke. The most probable supposition is that it was written between 50 and 60; the exact year can not even be guessed at. There is, however, not much doubt that the Gospel was written in Palestine.

(5.) *Purpose of the Gospel.*—The Gospel itself tells us by plain internal evidence that it was written for Jewish converts, to show them in Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah of the Old Testament whom they expected. Jewish converts over all the world seem to have been intended, and not merely Jews in Palestine.⁸ Jesus is the Messiah of the Old Testament, recognizable by Jews from his acts as such.⁹ Knowledge of Jewish customs and of the country is presupposed in the readers.¹⁰ Jerusalem is the holy city. Jesus is the son of David, of the seed of Abraham;¹¹ is to be born of a virgin in David's place, Bethlehem;¹² must flee into Egypt and be recalled thence;¹³ must have a forerunner, John the Baptist;¹⁴ was to labor in the

⁶ A complete list of these passages is given in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. ii. p. 277.

⁷ Origen in Eus. *H. E.* vi. 25; Irenæus iii. 1: comp. Muratorian fragment, as far as it remains, in Credner's *Kanon*.

⁸ Irenæus, Origen, and Jerome say simply that it was written "for the Hebrews."

⁹ Matt. i. 22, ii. 5, 15, 17, iv. 14, viii. 17, xii. 17-31, xiii. 35, xxi. 4, xxvii. 9.

¹⁰ Matt. xv. 1, 2, with Mark vii. 1-4; Matt. xxvii. 62, with Mark xv. 42; Luke xxiii. 54; John xix. 14, 31, 42, and other places.

¹¹ Matt. i. 1, ix. 27, xii. 23, xv. 22, xx. 30, xxi. 9, 15.

¹² i. 22, ii. 6.

¹³ ii. 15, 19.

¹⁴ iii. 3, xi. 10.

outcast Galilee that sat in darkness;¹⁵ his healing was a promised mark of his office;¹⁶ and so was his mode of teaching in parables;¹⁷ he entered the holy city as Messiah;¹⁸ was rejected by the people, in fulfillment of a prophecy,¹⁹ and deserted by his disciples in the same way.²⁰ The Gospel is pervaded by one principle, the fulfillment of the Law and of the Messianic prophecies in the person of Jesus. This at once sets it in opposition to the Judaism of the time; for it rebuked the Pharisaic interpretations of the Law,²¹ and proclaimed Jesus as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world through his blood—ideas which were strange to the cramped and limited Judaism of the Christian era.

(6.) *Contents of the Gospel.*—There are traces in this Gospel of an occasional superseding of the chronological order. Its principal divisions are— I. The introduction to the Ministry of Christ, i.-iv. II. The laying down of the new Law for the Church in the Sermon on the Mount, v.-vii. III. Events in historical order, showing him as the worker of Miracles, viii. and ix. IV. The appointment of Apostles to preach the Kingdom, x. V. The doubts and oppositions excited by his activity in divers minds—in John's disciples, in sundry cities, in the Pharisees, xi. and xii. VI. A series of parables on the nature of the Kingdom, xiii. VII. Similar to V. The effects of his ministry on his countrymen, on Herod, the people of Genesareth, Scribes and Pharisees, and on multitudes, whom he feeds, xiii. 53-xvi. 12. VIII. Revelation to his disciples of his sufferings. His instructions to them thereupon, xvi. 13-xviii. 35. IX. Events of a journey to Jerusalem, xix., xx. X. Entrance into Jerusalem and resistance to him there, and denunciation of the Pharisees, xxi.-xxiii. XI. Last discourses; Jesus as Lord and Judge of Jerusalem, and also of the world, xxiv., xxv. XII. Passion and Resurrection, xxvi.-xxviii.

§ 6. THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK.—The characteristics of this Gospel, the shortest of the four inspired records, will appear from the discussion of the various questions that have been raised about it.

(1.) *Sources of this Gospel.*—The tradition that it gives the teaching of Peter rather than of the rest of the Apostles, has been already alluded to.²² John the Presbyter is spoken of by Papias as the interpreter of Peter. Irenæus calls Mark "interpres et sectator Petri," and cites the opening and the concluding words of the Gospel as we now possess them.²³ Eusebius says, on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, that the hearers of Peter at Rome desired Mark, the follower of Peter, to leave with them a record of his teaching; upon which Mark wrote his Gospel, which the Apostle afterward sanctioned with his authority, and directed that it should be read in the Churches. Tertullian speaks of the Gospel of Mark as being connected with Peter, and so having Apostolic authority. If the evidence of the Apostle's connection with this Gospel rested wholly on these passages, it would not be sufficient, since the witnesses, though many in number, are not all independent of each other. But there are peculiarities in the Gospel which are best explained by the supposition that Peter in some way superintended its composition. While there is hardly any part of its narrative that is not common to it and some other Gospel, in the manner of the narrative there is often a marked character, which puts aside at once the

¹⁵ iv. 14-16.

¹⁶ viii. 17, xii. 17.

¹⁸ xxi. 5-16.

¹⁷ xiii. 14.

¹⁹ xxi. 42.

²⁰ xxvi. 31, 56.

²¹ See p. 686.

²² v., xxiii.

²³ *Hæc*, iii., x. 6.

supposition that we have here a mere epitome of Matthew and Luke. The picture of the same events is far more vivid; touches are introduced such as could only be noted by a vigilant eye-witness, and such as make us almost eye-witnesses of the Redeemer's doings. To this must be added that while Mark goes over the same ground for the most part as the other Evangelists, and especially Matthew, there are many facts thrown in which prove that we are listening to an independent witness. Thus the humble origin of Peter is made known through him,²⁴ and his connection with Capernaum;²⁵ he tells us that Levi was "the son of Alphæus,"²⁶ that Peter was the name given by our Lord to Simon,²⁷ and Boanerges a surname added by him to the names of two others;²⁸ he assumes the existence of another body of disciples wider than the Twelve;²⁹ we owe to him the name of Jairus,³⁰ the word "carpenter" applied to our Lord,³¹ the nation of the "Syro-Phœnician" woman;³² he substitutes Dalmanutha for the "Magdala" of Matthew;³³ he names Bartimæus;³⁴ he alone mentions that our Lord would not suffer any man to carry any vessel through the Temple;³⁵ and that Simon of Cyrene was the father of Alexander and Rufus.³⁶ All these are tokens of an independent writer, different from Matthew and Luke, and in the absence of other traditions it is natural to look to Peter. One might hope that much light would be thrown on this question from the way in which Peter is mentioned in the Gospel; but the evidence is not so clear as might have been expected.

(2.) *This Gospel was written primarily for Gentiles.*—The Evangelist scarcely refers to the Old Testament in his own person. The word Law does not once occur. The genealogy of our Lord is not set forth. Other matters interesting chiefly to the Jews are likewise omitted; such as the references to the Old Testament and Law in Matt. xii. 5-7, the reflections on the request of the Scribes and Pharisees for a sign, Matt. xii. 38-45; the parable of the king's son, Matt. xxii. 1-14; and the awful denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees in Matt. xxiii. Explanations are given in some places, which Jews could not require: thus, Jordan is a "river;"³⁷ the Pharisees, etc. "used to fast,"³⁸ and other customs of theirs are described;³⁹ "the time of figs was not yet," i. e., at the season of the Passover;⁴⁰ the Sadducees' worst tenet is mentioned;⁴¹ the Mount of Olives is "over against the Temple;"⁴² at the Passover men eat "unleavened bread,"⁴³ and explanations are given which Jews would not need.⁴⁴ From the general testimony of these and other places, whatever may be objected to an inference from one or other among them, there is little doubt but that the Gospel was meant for use in the first instance among Gentiles.

(3.) *Time when the Gospel was written.*—It will be understood, from what has been said, that nothing positive can be asserted as to the time when this Gospel was written. The traditions are contradictory. Irenæus says that it was written after the death of the Apostle Peter; but in other passages it is supposed to be written during Peter's life-time. In the Bible there

²⁴ Mark i. 16-20.²⁵ ii. 14.²⁶ iii. 17.²⁷ iii. 32, iv. 10, 36, viii. 34, xiv. 51, 52.²⁸ v. 22.²⁹ vii. 28.³⁰ x. 46.³¹ xv. 21.³² i. 20.³³ iii. 16.³⁴ vi. 3.³⁵ viii. 10.³⁶ xi. 16.³⁷ Mark i. 5; Matt. iii. 6.³⁸ Mark ii. 13; Matt. ix. 14.³⁹ Mark vii. 1-4; Matt. xv. 1, 2.⁴⁰ Mark xi. 13; Matt. xxi. 19.⁴¹ Mark xii. 13.⁴² Mark xiii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 3.⁴³ Mark xiv. 1-12; Matt. xxvi. 2, 17.⁴⁴ Mark xv. 6, 16, 42; Matt. xxvii. 15, 27.

57.

is nothing to decide the question. It is not likely that it dates before the reference to Mark in the Epistle to the Colossians,⁴⁵ where he is only introduced as a relative of Barnabas, as if this were his greatest distinction; and this Epistle was written about A.D. 62. On the other hand it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem.⁴⁶ Probably, therefore, it was written between A.D. 63 and 70.

(4.) *Place where the Gospel was written.*—The place is as uncertain as the time. Clement, Eusebius, Jerome and Epiphanius pronounce for Rome, and many moderns take the same view. Chrysostom thinks Alexandria; but this is not confirmed by other testimony.

(5.) *Genuineness of the Gospel.*—All ancient testimony makes Mark the author of a certain Gospel, and that this is the Gospel which has come down to us there is not the least historical ground for doubting. Owing to the very few sections peculiar to Mark, evidence from patristic quotation is somewhat difficult to produce. Justin Martyr, however, quotes ch. ix. 44, 46, 48, xii. 30, and iii. 17, and Irenæus cites both the opening and closing words:⁴⁷—an important testimony in any case, but doubly so from the doubt that has been cast on the closing verses.⁴⁸ The passage is rejected by the majority of modern critics, on the testimony of MSS. and of old writers, and on the internal evidence of the diction. Though it is probable that this section is from a different hand, and was annexed to the Gospel soon after the time of the Apostles, it must be remembered that it is found in three of the four great uncial MSS. (A. C. D.), besides being quoted without any question by Irenæus. With the exception of these few verses, the genuineness of the Gospel is placed above the reach of reasonable doubt.

(6.) *Style and Diction.*—The purpose of the Evangelist seems to be to place before us a vivid picture of the earthly acts of Jesus. The style is peculiarly suitable to this. He uses the present tense instead of the narrative aorist, almost in every chapter. The word *εὐθέως*, “straightway,” is used by St. Mark forty-one times. The first person is preferred to the third.⁴⁹ Precise and minute details as to persons, places and numbers, abound in the narrative. All these tend to give force and vividness to the picture of the human life of our Lord. On the other side, the facts are not very exactly arranged; they are often connected by nothing more definite than *καί* and *πάλιν*. Its conciseness sometimes makes this Gospel more obscure than the others.⁵⁰

(7.) *Contents of the Gospel.*—Though this Gospel has little historical matter which is not shared with some other, it would be a great error to suppose that the voice of Mark could have been silenced without injury to the divine harmony. The minute painting of the scenes in which the Lord took part, the fresh and lively mode of the narration, the very absence of the precious discourses of Jesus, which, interposed between his deeds, would have delayed the action, all give to this Gospel a character of its own. It is the history of the war of Jesus against sin and evil in the world during the time that he dwelt as a man among men. Its motto might well be, as Lange observes, those words of Peter: “How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good,

⁴⁵ Col. iv. 10.

⁴⁶ Mark xiii. 13, 24-30, 33, etc.

⁴⁷ *Hæc.* iii., x. 6. ⁴⁸ Mark xvi. 9-19.

⁴⁹ iv. 39, v. 8, 9, 12, vi. 2, 3, 31, 33, ix. 25, 33, xii. 6.

⁵⁰ See Mark i. 13, ix. 5, 6, iv. 10-24.

and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him."⁸¹ It develops a series of acts in this conflict, broken by times of rest and refreshing, in the wilderness or on the mountain. It records the exploits of the Son of God in the war against Satan, and the retirement in which, after each, he returned to commune with his Father, and bring back fresh strength for new encounters. Thus the passage from ii. 1 to iii. 6 describes his first conflict with the Pharisees, and it ends in a conspiracy of Pharisees and Herodians for his destruction, before which he retires to the sea.⁸² The passage from iii. 13 to vi. 6 contains the account of his contact with the unbelief of his own countrymen, ending with those remarkable words, "And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk and healed them:" then constrained (so to speak) in his working by their resistance, he retired for that time from the struggle, and "went round about the villages teaching."⁸³

The principal divisions in the Gospel are these:—1. John the Baptist and Jesus.⁸⁴ 2. Acts of Jesus in Galilee.⁸⁵ 3. Teaching in *l'eræa*, where the spirit of the new kingdom of the Gospel is brought out.⁸⁶ 4. Teaching, trials, and sufferings in Jerusalem. Jesus revealing himself as Founder of the new kingdom.⁸⁷ 5. Resurrection.⁸⁸

§ 7. THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE.—(1.) *Origin of the Gospel.*—The preface, contained in the first four verses of the Gospel, describes the object of its writer:—"Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." Here are several facts to be observed. There were many narratives of the life of our Lord current at the early time when Luke wrote his Gospel. The word "many" cannot apply to Matthew and Mark, because it must at any rate include more than two, and because it is implied that former laborers leave something still to do, and that the writer will supersede or supplement them either in whole or in part. The ground of fitness for the task St. Luke places in his having carefully followed out the whole course of events from the beginning. He does not claim the character of an eye-witness from the first; but possibly he may have been a witness of some part of our Lord's doings.

The ancient opinion, that Luke wrote his Gospel under the influence of Paul, rests on the authority of Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius. The two first assert that we have in Luke the Gospel preached by Paul;⁸⁹ Origen calls it "the Gospel quoted by Paul," alluding to Rom. ii. 16;⁹⁰ and Eusebius refers Paul's words, "according to my Gospel,"⁹¹ to that of Luke,⁹² in which Jerome concurs.⁹³ The language of the preface is against the notion of any exclusive influence of St. Paul. The Evangelist, a man on whom the Spirit of God was, made the history of the Saviour's life the subject of research, and with materials so obtained he wrote, under the guidance of the Spirit that was upon him, the history now before us. The four

⁸¹ Acts x. 38.⁸² Mark vi. 6.⁸³ L. 14-ix. 50.⁸⁴ x. 38-xv. 47.⁸⁵ Mark iii. 7.⁸⁶ i. 1-13.⁸⁷ x. 1-34.⁸⁸ xvi.⁸⁹ Iren. *cont. Hæc.* iii. 1; Tert. *cont. Marc.* iv. 5.⁹⁰ Euseb. *H. E.* vi. 25.⁹¹ 2 Tim. ii. 18.⁹² *H. E.* iii. 4.⁹³ *De Vir.* iii. 7.

verses could not have been put at the head of a history composed under the exclusive guidance of Paul or of any one Apostle, and as little could they have introduced a Gospel simply communicated by another. Yet if we compare St. Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper⁶⁴ with that in St. Luke's Gospel,⁶⁵ none will think that the verbal similarity could be accidental. A less obvious parallel between 1 Cor. xv. 8 and Luke xxiv. 26, 27, more of thought than of expression, tends the same way. The truth seems to be that St. Luke, seeking information from every quarter, sought it especially from the preaching of his beloved master, St. Paul; and the Apostle in his turn employed the knowledge acquired from other sources by his disciple. Thus the preaching of the Apostle, founded on the same body of facts, and the same arrangement of them, as the rest of the Apostles used, became assimilated especially to that which St. Luke set forth in his narrative.

(2.) *Date of the Gospel, and place where it was written.*—It is known that this Gospel was in use before the year 120. From internal evidence the date can be more nearly fixed. From Acts i. 1, it is clear that it was written before the Acts of the Apostles. The latest time actually mentioned in the Acts is the term of two years during which Paul dwelt at Rome “in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him.”⁶⁶ The writer, who has tracked the footsteps of Paul hitherto with such exactness, leaves him here abruptly, without making known the result of his appeal to Cæsar, or the works in which he engaged afterward. No other motive for this silence can be suggested than that the writer, at the time when he published the Acts, had no more to tell; and in that case the book of the Acts was completed about the end of the second year of St. Paul's imprisonment, that is, about A.D. 68. How much earlier the Gospel, described as “the former treatise,”⁶⁷ may have been written is uncertain; but the words imply some considerable interval between the two productions. The opinion thus becomes very probable, that it was written at Cæsarea during St. Paul's imprisonment there, A.D. 58-60. The Gospel of St. Matthew was probably written about the same time; and neither Evangelist appears to have used the other, although both made use of that form of oral teaching which the Apostles had gradually come to employ.

(3.) *Purposes for which the Gospel was written.*—The Evangelist professes to write that Theophilus “might know the certainty of those things wherein he had been instructed.”⁶⁸ Who was this Theophilus? Some have supposed that it is a significant name, applicable not to one man, but to any *amans Dei*; but the addition of *κράτιστος*, a term of honor which would be used toward a man of station, or sometimes toward a personal friend, seems against this. He was, then, an existing person. Some indications are given in the Gospel about him. He was not an inhabitant of Palestine, for the Evangelist minutely describes the position of places which to such a one would be well known. It is so with Capernaum,⁶⁹ Nazareth,⁷⁰ Arimathæa,⁷¹ the country of the Gadarenes,⁷² the distance of Mount Olivet and Emmaus from Jerusalem.⁷³ By the same test he probably was not a Macedonian,⁷⁴ nor an Athenian,⁷⁵ nor a Cretan.⁷⁶ But that he was a native of Italy, and perhaps an inhabitant of Rome, is probable from similar data. In tracing

⁶⁴ 1 Cor. xi. 23-25.⁶⁵ Acts xxviii. 30, 31.⁶⁶ Luke i. 4.⁶⁷ Luke xxii. 19, 20.⁶⁸ Acts i. 1.⁶⁹ Luke iv. 31.⁷⁰ Acts xxvii. 8, 12.⁷¹ i. 26.⁷² Acts i. 12; Luk xxiv. 13.⁷³ Acts xvi. 12.⁷⁴ xxiii. 51.⁷⁵ vii. 26.⁷⁶ Acts xvii. 91.

St. Paul's journey to Rome, places which an Italian might be supposed not to know are described minutely ;⁷⁷ but when he comes to Sicily and Italy this is neglected. Syracuse and Rhegium, even the more obscure Puteoli, and Appii Forum and the Three Taverns, are mentioned as to one likely to know them. All that emerges from this argument is, that the person for whom Luke wrote in the first instance was a Gentile reader. There are other marks of the Gospel being intended for Gentile rather than Jewish converts. The genealogy of Jesus is traced to Adam, not from Abraham ; so as to connect him with the whole human race, and not merely with the Jews. Luke describes the mission of the Seventy, which number has been usually supposed to be typical of all nations ; as twelve, the number of the Apostles, represents the Jews and their twelve tribes. As each Gospel has, within certain limits, its own character and mode of treatment, we shall recognize with Olshausen that " St. Luke has the peculiar power of exhibiting, with great clearness of conception and truth (especially in the long account of Christ's journey, from ix. 51 to xviii. 34), not so much the discourses of Jesus as his conversations, with all the incidents that gave rise to them, with the remarks of those who were present, and with the final results."

(4.) *Integrity of the Gospel—the first two Chapters.*—A special question has been raised about the first two chapters. The chief objection against them is founded on the garbled opening of Marcion's Gospel, who omits the first two chapters, and connects iii. 1 immediately with iv. 31. But any objection founded on this would apply to the third chapter as well ; and the history of our Lord's childhood seems to have been known to and quoted by Justin Martyr⁷⁸ about the time of Marcion. There is therefore no real ground for distinguishing between the first two chapters and the rest ; and the arguments for the genuineness of St. Luke's Gospel apply to the whole inspired narrative as we now possess it.

(5) *Contents of the Gospel.*—This Gospel contains—1. A preface ; i. 1-4. 2. An account of the time preceding the ministry of Jesus ; i. 5-ii. 52. 3. Several accounts of discourses and acts of our Lord, common to Luke, Matthew, and Mark, related for the most part in their order, and belonging to Capernaum and the neighborhood ; iii. 1-ix. 50. 4. A collection of similar accounts, referring to a certain journey to Jerusalem, most of them peculiar to Luke ; ix. 51-xviii. 14. 5. An account of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Jesus, common to Luke with the other Evangelists, except as to some of the accounts of what took place after the resurrection ; xxviii. 15 to the end.

§ 8. THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.—(1.) *Authority.*—No doubt has been entertained at any time in the Church, either of the canonical authority of this Gospel, or of its being written by St. John the Apostle. No other book of the New Testament is authenticated by testimony of so early a date as that of the disciples which is embodied in the Gospel itself.⁷⁹ Among the Apostolic Fathers, Ignatius appears to have known and recognized it.

(2) *Place and time at which it was written.*—Ephesus and Patmos are the two places mentioned by early writers ; and the weight of evidence seems to preponderate in favor of Ephesus. The Apostle's sojourn at Ephesus probably began after St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy were written, i. e., after

⁷⁷ Acts xxvii. 8, 12, 16.

⁷⁸ John xxi. 24, 25.

⁷⁹ See *Apology*, i. § 83, and an allusion, in the *Dial. cum Tryph.* 100.

A.D. 66. Eusebius specifies the fourteenth year of Domitian, i. e., A.D. 95, as the year of the banishment to Patmos. Probably the date of the Gospel may lie about midway between these two, about A.D. 78. But some place it after the Apocalypse.

(3.) *Occasion and scope.*—After the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 69, Ephesus probably became the centre of the active life of Eastern Christendom. This half-Greek half-Oriental city contained a large church of faithful Christians, a multitude of zealous Jews, an indigenous population devoted to the worship of a strange idol, whose image was borrowed from the East, its name from the West. It was the place to which Cerinthus chose to bring the doctrines which he devised or learned at Alexandria. The Gospel was obviously addressed primarily to Christians, not to heathens. The chief object of the writer was probably to supplement the earlier Gospels. There is no intrinsic improbability in the early tradition as to the occasion and scope of this Gospel, which is most fully related in the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia, to the effect that while St. John lived at Ephesus, and visited all parts of Asia, the writings of Matthew, Mark, and even Luke, came into the hands of the Christians, and were diligently circulated everywhere. Then it occurred to the Christians of Asia that St. John was a more credible witness than all others, forasmuch as from the beginning, even before Matthew, he was with the Lord, and enjoyed more abundant grace through the love which the Lord bore to him. And they brought him the books, and sought to know his opinion of them. Then he praised the writers for their veracity, and said that a few things had been omitted by them. And he added that they who discourse of the coming of Christ in the flesh ought not to omit to speak of his Divinity, lest in process of time men who are used to such discourses might suppose that Christ was only what he appeared to be. Thereupon the brethren exhorted him to write at once the things which he judged the most important for instruction, and which he saw omitted by the others. And he did so. And therefore from the beginning he discoursed about the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ, judging this to be the necessary beginning of the Gospel, and from it he went on to the incarnation.

(4.) *Contents and Integrity.*—There is no book in the New Testament which more strongly than the fourth Gospel impresses the reader with the notion of its unity and integrity. And yet it does not appear to be written with such close adherence to a preconceived plan as a Western writer would show in developing and illustrating some one leading idea. Its contents may be arranged in the following order:

A. THE PROLOGUE, i. 1–18.

B. THE HISTORY, i. 19–xx. 29.

(a.) Various events relating to our Lord's ministry, narrated in connection with seven journeys, i. 19–xii. 50:

1. First journey, into Judæa, and beginning of his ministry, i. 19–ii. 12.
 2. Second journey, and appearance at the Passover in the first year of his ministry, ii. 13–iv.—The manifestation of his glory in Jerusalem, ii. 13–iii. 21, and in the journey back, iii. 22–iv.

3. Third journey, in the second year of his ministry, about the Passover, v.

4. Fourth journey, about the Passover in the third year of his ministry, beyond Jordan, vi.—His glory shown by the multiplication of the loaves, and

by his walking on the sea, and by the discourses with the Jews, his disciples and his Apostles.

5. Fifth journey, six months before his death, begun at the Feast of Tabernacles, vii.-x. 21.—Circumstances in which the journey was undertaken, vii. 1-13; five signs of his glory shown at Jerusalem, vii. 14-x. 21.

6. Sixth journey, about the Feast of Dedication, x. 22-42.—His testimony in Solomon's porch, and his departure beyond Jordan.

7. Seventh journey in Judæa toward Bethany, xi. 1-54.—The raising of Lazarus and its consequences.

8. Eighth journey, before his last Passover, xi. 55-xii.—Plots of the Jews, his entry into Jerusalem, and into the Temple, and the manifestation of his glory there.

(b). History of the Death of Christ, xiii.-xx. 29.

1. Preparation for his Passion, xiii.-xvii.—Last Supper, discourse to his disciples, his commendatory prayer.

2. The circumstances of his Passion and Death, xviii. xix.—His apprehension, trial, and crucifixion.

3. His Resurrection, and the proofs of it, xx. 1-29.

C. THE CONCLUSION, xx. 30-xxi.

1. Scope of the foregoing history, xx. 30, 31.

2. Confirmation of the authority of the Evangelist by additional historical facts, and by the testimony supposed to be that of the elders of the Church, xxi. 1-24.

3. Reason of the termination of the history, xxi. 25.

Some portions of the Gospel have been regarded by certain critics as interpolations. The 25th verse and the latter half of the 24th of ch. xxi. are generally received as an undisguised addition, probably by the elders of the Ephesian Church, where the Gospel was first published.

§ 9. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES is described as a second treatise⁸⁰ by St. Luke. The identity of the writer of both books is strongly shown by their great similarity in style and idiom, and the usage of particular words and compound forms. It commences with an inscription to the same Theophilus to whom St. Luke dedicates his Gospel.⁸¹ But its design must not be supposed to be limited to the edification of Theophilus, whose name is prefixed only, as was customary then as now, by way of dedication. The readers were evidently intended to be the members of the Christian Church, whether Jews or Gentiles; for its contents are such as are of the utmost consequence to the whole Church. They are *The fulfillment of the promise of the Father by the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the results of that outpouring, by the dispersion of the Gospel among Jews and Gentiles.* Under these leading heads all the personal and subordinate details may be ranged. Immediately after the Ascension, St. Peter, the first of the Twelve, designated by our Lord as the Rock on whom the Church was to be built, the holder of the keys of the kingdom, becomes the prime actor under God in the founding of the Church. He is the centre of the first great group of sayings and doings. The opening of the door to Jews (ch. ii.) and Gentiles (ch. x.) is his office, and by him, in good time, is accomplished. But none of the existing twelve Apostles were, humanly speaking, fitted to preach the Gospel to the cultivated Gentile world. To be by divine grace the spiritual conqueror of

⁸⁰ δεύτερος λόγος.

⁸¹ See p. 706.

Asia and Europe, God raised up another instrument, from among the highly-educated and zealous Pharisees. The preparation of Saul of Tarsus for the work to be done, the progress of that work in his hand, his journeyings, preachings, and perils, his stripes and imprisonments, his testifying in Jerusalem and being brought to testify in Rome—these are the subjects of the latter half of the book, of which the great central figure is the Apostle Paul.

Any view which attributes to the writer, as his chief design, some collateral purpose which is served by the book as it stands, or indeed any purpose beyond that of writing a faithful history of such facts as seemed important in the spread of the Gospel, is now generally, and very properly, treated as erroneous. Such a view has become celebrated in modern times, as held by Baur—that the purpose of the writer was to compare the two great Apostles, to show that St. Paul did not depart from the principles which regulated St. Peter, and to exalt him at every opportunity by comparison with St. Peter. The reader need hardly be reminded how little any such purpose is borne out by the contents of the book itself; nay, how naturally they would follow their present sequence, without any such thought having been in the writer's mind. Doubtless many ends are answered and many results brought out by the book as its narrative proceeds: as, *e. g.*, the rejection of the Gospel by the Jewish people everywhere, and its gradual transference to the Gentiles; and others which might be easily gathered up, and made by ingenious hypothesizers, such as Baur, to appear as if the writer were bent on each one in its turn, as the chief object of his work.

As to the time when, and place at which, the book was written, we are left to gather them entirely from indirect notices. It seems probable that the place of writing was Rome, and the time about two years from the date of St. Paul's arrival there, as related in ch. xxviii., *sub fin.* Had any considerable alteration in the Apostle's circumstances taken place before the publication, there can be no reason why it should not have been noticed. And on other accounts also this time was by far the most likely for the publication of the book. The arrival in Rome was an important period in the Apostle's life: the quiet which succeeded it seemed to promise no immediate determination of his cause. A large amount of historic material had been collected in Judæa, and during the various missionary journeys; or, taking another and not less probable view, Nero was beginning to undergo that change for the worse which disgraced the latter portion of his reign: none could tell how soon the whole outward repose of Roman society might be shaken, and the tacit toleration which the Christians enjoyed be exchanged for bitter persecution. If such terrors were imminent, there would surely be in the Roman Church prophets and teachers who might tell them of the storm which was gathering, and warn them that the records lying ready for publication must be given to the faithful before its outbreak or event. Such *à priori* considerations would, it is true, weigh but little against presumptive evidence furnished by the book itself; but arrayed, as they are, in aid of such evidence, they carry some weight, when we find that the time naturally and fairly indicated in the book itself for its publication is that one of all others when we should conceive that publication most likely. This would give us for the publication the year 63 A.D., according to the most probable assignment of the date of the arrival of St. Paul at Rome.

The genuineness of the Acts of the Apostles has ever been recognized by the Church. The text is very full of various readings; more so than any oth-

er book of the New Testament. To this several reasons may have contributed. In many backward references to Gospel history, and the many anticipations of statements and expressions occurring in the Epistles, temptations abounded for a corrector to try his hand at assimilating, and, as he thought, reconciling, the various accounts. In places where ecclesiastical order or usage was in question, insertions or omissions were made to suit the habits and views of the Church in after-times. Where the narrative simply related facts, any act or word apparently unworthy of the Apostolic agent was modified for the sake of decorum. Where St. Paul repeats to different audiences, or the writer himself narrates, the details of his miraculous conversion, the one passage was pieced from the other, so as to produce verbal accordance.

II. THE FOURTEEN EPISTLES OF PAUL.

§ 10. The EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL have claimed so much of our attention in connection with the Apostle's life, that nothing remains to be added here except in one or two cases. The order assigned to them in the Canon, which is not that of their chronological sequence, seems to have been determined partly by their magnitude and partly by their contents. Somewhat as with the division of the Hebrew prophets into Greater and Lesser, the *Romans* and 1 and 2 *Corinthians* seem to be placed first as being the longest, and they may also take precedence as containing full discussions of great points of Christian faith and practice.⁸² Of the shorter Epistles, *Galatians* has a close doctrinal connection with *Romans*;⁸³ *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, and *Colossians* are too much alike not to have been placed together, though their order is transposed;⁸⁴ and 1 and 2 *Thessalonians*, the first written, seem to be placed last because of their allusions to the last times. The four *personal* Epistles, 1 and 2 *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Philemon*, are placed together, at the expense of severing the connection of *Philemon* with *Colossians*. The position of *Hebrews* last of all, and separated from the other Epistles to Churches, indicates the doubt of its Pauline authorship.

1. EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. See c. xvii. §§ 14, 15.
2. FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. See c. xvii. §§ 7-9.
3. SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS. See c. xvii. §§ 12, 13.
4. EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. See c. xvii. § 2.
5. EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. See c. xviii. § 18.
6. EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS. See c. xviii. § 19.
7. EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS. See c. xviii. § 16.
8. FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS. See c. xvi. §§ 7, 13.
9. SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS. See c. xvi. §§ 7, 13.
10. FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.⁸⁵ See c. xix. §§ 4-6.
11. SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY. See c. xix. §§ 7, 10.
12. EPISTLE TO TITUS. See c. xix. § 7.
13. EPISTLE TO PHILEMON. See c. xviii. § 17.
14. EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.—(1.) *Canonical authority*.—The immediate successors of the Apostles seem to have regarded this Epistle as of canonical authority; but from the middle of the second to the middle of

⁸² Another reason for the order may perhaps be found in the importance of the churches of Rome and Corinth.

⁸³ It is probably on account of its argumentative character that *Hebrews* stands next to *Galatians* in some ancient copies.

⁸⁴ It should be, as we have seen, *Colossians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*.

⁸⁵ The arguments on the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles are stated at length in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. III. p. 1507 seq.

the fourth century it was generally rejected by the Fathers of the Roman and North African churches. At the latter end of the fourth century, Jerome, the most learned and critical of the Latin Fathers, reviewed the conflicting opinions as to the authority of this Epistle. He considered that the prevailing though not universal view of the Latin churches was of less weight than the view not only of ancient writers, but also of all the Greek and all the Eastern churches, where the Epistle was received as canonical and read daily; and he pronounced a decided opinion in favor of its authority. The great contemporary light of North Africa, St. Augustine, held a similar opinion. The third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, and a Decretal of Pope Innocent, A.D. 416, gave a final confirmation to the decision of the Eastern churches in its favor. The doubts were confined to the Latin churches from the middle of the second to the close of the fourth century. All the rest of orthodox Christendom from the beginning was agreed upon the canonical authority of this Epistle.

(2.) *Authorship.*—The superscription, the ordinary source of information, is wanting; but there is no reason to doubt that at first, everywhere except in North Africa, St. Paul was regarded as the author. Clement of Alexandria ascribed to St. Luke the translation of the Epistle into Greek from a Hebrew original of St. Paul. Origen believed that the thoughts were St. Paul's, the language and composition St. Luke's or Clement's of Rome. Tertullian names Barnabas as the reputed author according to the North African tradition. The view of the Alexandrian Fathers, a middle point between the Eastern and Western traditions, won its way in the Church. Luther's conjecture that Apollos was the author has been widely adopted. If it be asked to what extent, and by whom St. Paul was assisted in the composition of this Epistle, the reply must be in the words of Origen, "Who wrote [*i. e.*, as in Rom. xvi. 22, wrote from the author's dictation] this Epistle, only God knows." The similarity in phraseology which exists between the acknowledged writings of St. Luke and this Epistle, his constant companionship with St. Paul, and his habit of listening to and recording the Apostle's arguments, form a strong presumption in his favor.

(3.) The question *to whom the Epistle was sent* was agitated as early as the time of Chrysostom, who replies,—to the Jews in Jerusalem and Palestine. The argument of the Epistle is such as could be used with most effect to a church consisting exclusively of Jews by birth, personally familiar with and attached to the Temple-service. Other arguments have been already stated.⁶⁶ Some critics have maintained that this Epistle was addressed directly to Jewish believers everywhere; others have restricted it to those who dwelt in Asia and Greece.

(4.) *Time and place.*—Eastern traditions of the fourth century, in connection with the opinion that St. Paul is the writer, name Italy and Rome, or Athens, as the place from whence the Epistle was written. Either place would agree with, perhaps was suggested by, the mention of Timothy in the last chapter. The Epistle was evidently written before the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The whole argument, and specially the passages viii. 4 seq., ix. 6 seq., and xiii. 10 seq., imply that the Temple was standing, and that its usual course of Divine service was carried on without interruption. The date which best agrees with the traditionary account of the authorship and destination of the Epistle is A.D. 63, about the end of

⁶⁶ Chap. xix. § 20.

St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, and soon after Albinus succeeded Festus as Procurator.

(5.) *Language in which it was written.*—Like St. Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews has afforded ground for much controversy respecting the language in which it was originally written. The earliest statement is that of Clement of Alexandria, to the effect that it was written by St. Paul in Hebrew, and translated by St. Luke into Greek. But nothing is said to lead us to regard it as a tradition, rather than a conjecture suggested by the style of the Epistle. If the Epistle was written to the churches of Judæa, it would naturally be in Hebrew, that is, the vernacular Aramaic. The arguments in support of a Greek original rest on the grounds of (i.) the purity and easy flow of the Greek; (ii.) the use of Greek words which could not be adequately expressed in Hebrew without long periphrase; (iii.) the use of paronomasia; and (iv.) the use of the Septuagint in quotations and references. All these would be consistent with the theory of a double original.

(6.) *Condition of the Hebrews, and Scope of the Epistle.*—The numerous Christian churches scattered throughout Judæa⁸⁷ were continually exposed to persecution from the Jews;⁸⁸ but in Jerusalem there was one additional weapon in the hands of the predominant oppressors of the Christians. The magnificent national Temple might be shut against the Hebrew Christian; and even if this affliction were not often laid upon him, yet there was a secret burden which he bore within him, the knowledge that the end of all the beauty and awfulness of Zion was rapidly approaching. What could take the place of the Temple, and that which was behind the veil, and the Levitical sacrifices, and the Holy City, when they should cease to exist? What compensation could Christianity offer him for the loss which was pressing the Hebrew Christian more and more? The writer of this Epistle meets the Hebrew Christians on their own ground. His answer is—"Your new faith gives you Christ, and in Christ all you seek, all your fathers sought. In Christ the Son of God you have an all-sufficient Mediator, nearer than angels to the Father, eminent above Moses as a benefactor, more sympathizing and more prevailing than the high-priest as an intercessor: his sabbath awaits you in heaven; to his covenant the old was intended to be subservient; his atonement is the eternal reality of which sacrifices are but the passing shadow; his city heavenly, not made with hands. Having him, believe in him with all your heart, with a faith in the unseen future, strong as that of the saints of old, patient under present, and prepared for coming woe, full of energy, and hope, and holiness, and love." Such was the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

III. THE SEVEN CATHOLIC OR GENERAL EPISTLES.

§ 11. EPISTLE OF JAMES.—(1.) *Its Genuineness and Canonicity.*—In the third book of his Ecclesiastical History, Eusebius places the Epistle of St. James, the Second and Third Epistle of St. John, and the Epistle of St. Jude among the *Antilegomena* or disputed books of the New Testament. Elsewhere he refers the Epistle to the class of "spurious." It is found in the Syriac version, and appears to be referred to by Clement of Rome,

⁸⁷ Acts ix. 31; Gal. i. 22.

⁸⁸ 1 Thess. ii. 14.

Hermas, and Irenæus, and is quoted by almost all the Fathers of the fourth century. In 397 the Council of Carthage accepted it as canonical, and from that time there has been no further question of its genuineness on the score of external testimony. But at the time of the Reformation the question of its authenticity was again raised, and now upon the ground of internal evidence; the chief objection being a supposed opposition between St. Paul and St. James, on the doctrine of Justification, inconsiderately urged by Luther.

(2.) *Its Author.*—The author of the Epistle must be either James the son of Zebedee, according to the subscription of the Syriac version; or James the son of Alphæus; or James the brother of the Lord, which is the general opinion; or an unknown James. Internal evidence points unmistakably to James the Just as the writer, and we have already identified James the Just with the son of Alphæus.⁶⁹ It was written from Jerusalem, which St. James does not seem to have ever left. The time at which he wrote it has been fixed as late as A.D. 62, and as early as A.D. 45. Those who see in its writer a desire to counteract the effects of a misconstruction of St. Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith, in ii. 14-26, and those who see a reference to the immediate destruction of Jerusalem in v. 1, and an allusion to the name Christians in ii. 7, argue in favor of the later date. The earlier is advocated chiefly on the ground that the Epistle could not have been written by St. James after the Council in Jerusalem, without allusion to what was there decided, and because the Gentile Christian does not yet appear to be recognized.

(3.) *Its object.*—The main object of the Epistle is not to teach doctrine, but to improve morality. St. James is the moral teacher of the New Testament. There are two ways of explaining this characteristic of the Epistle. Some commentators and writers see in St. James a man who had not realized the essential principles and peculiarities of Christianity, but was in a transition state, half Jew and half Christian. But there is another and much more natural way of accounting for the fact. St. James was writing for a special class of persons, and knew what that class especially needed. Those for whom he wrote were the Jewish Christians, whether in Jerusalem or abroad. The two objects of the Epistle are—1. to warn against the sins to which as Jews they were most liable; 2. to console and exhort them under the sufferings to which as Christians they were most exposed.

The Jewish vices against which he warns them are—Formalism, which made the service of God consist in washings and outward ceremonies, whereas he reminds them (i. 27) that it consists rather in Active Love and Purity; Fanaticism, which under the cloak of religious zeal was tearing Jerusalem to pieces (i. 20); Fatalism, which threw its sins on God (i. 13); Meanness, which crouched before the rich (ii. 2); Falsehood, which had made words and oaths playthings (iii. 2-12); Partisanship (iii. 14); Evil-speaking (iv. 11); Boasting (iv. 16); Oppression (v. 4). The great lesson which he teaches them as Christians is Patience—Patience in trial (i. 2); Patience in good works (i. 22-25); Patience under provocations (iii. 17); Patience under oppression (v. 7); Patience under persecution (v. 10); and the ground of their Patience is, that the Coming of the Lord draweth nigh, which is to right all wrongs (v. 8). Respecting the doctrinal teaching of ch. ii., we must be content to refer to Professor Lightfoot's masterly

⁶⁹ See ch. ix. *Notes and Illustrations* (A), THE BROTHERN OF OUR LORD.

proof that St. James is arguing from one point of view, as St. Paul argues from another, against the *Jewish* errors on Justification (*Commentary on the Galatians*, notes "On the Words denoting Faith," and "On the Faith of Abraham").

§ 12. FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.—The external evidence of authenticity is of the strongest kind. Referred to in the Second Epistle (iii. 1); known to Polycarp and frequently alluded to in his Epistle to the Philippians; recognized by Papias;⁹⁰ repeatedly quoted by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen; it was accepted without hesitation by the universal Church. As to its character and contents, see c. xix. §§ 16-18.

The SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER presents questions of far greater difficulty than the former. We have few references, and none of a very positive character, in the writings of the early Fathers; the style differs materially from that of the First Epistle, and the resemblance, amounting to a studied imitation, between this Epistle and that of Jude, seems scarcely reconcilable with the position of Peter. Doubts as to its genuineness were entertained by the greatest critics of the early Church; in the time of Eusebius it was reckoned among the disputed books, and was not formally admitted into the Canon until the year 393, at the Council of Hippo. In reply to these objections, we may remark:—1. With regard to its recognition by the early Church, we observe that it was not likely to be quoted frequently; it was addressed to a portion of the Church not at that time much in intercourse with the rest of Christendom: the documents of the primitive Church are far too scanty to give weight to the argument from omission. Although it can not be proved to have been referred to by any author earlier than Origen, yet passages from Clement of Rome, Hermas, Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch and Irenæus, suggest an acquaintance with this Epistle. It is also distinctly stated by Eusebius and by Photinus that Clement of Alexandria wrote a commentary on all the disputed Epistles, in which this was certainly included. Didymus refers to it very frequently in his great work on the Trinity. It was certainly included in the collection of Catholic Epistles known to Eusebius and Origen. The historical evidence is certainly inconclusive, but not such as to require or to warrant the rejection of the Epistle. The silence of the Fathers is accounted for more easily than its admission into the Canon after the question as to its genuineness had been raised.

2. The difference of style may be admitted. The only question is, whether it is greater than can be satisfactorily accounted for, supposing that the Apostle employed a different person as his amanuensis. If we admit that some time intervened between the composition of the two works, that in writing the first the Apostle was aided by Silvanus, and in the second by another, perhaps by Mark, that the circumstances of the churches addressed by him were considerably changed, and that the second was written in greater haste, the differences may be regarded as insufficient to justify more than hesitation in admitting its genuineness. The resemblance to the Epistle of Jude may be admitted without affecting our judgment unfavorably.

3. The doubts as to its genuineness appear to have originated with the critics of Alexandria, where, however, the Epistle itself was formally recognized at a very early period.

⁹⁰ Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* iii. 39.

§ 13. THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN—FIRST EPISTLE.—The external evidence of its authenticity is of the most satisfactory nature. It was acknowledged and received as the production of the Apostle John by all the early Fathers; and there is no voice in antiquity raised to the contrary. The internal evidence for its being the work of St. John, from its similarity in style, language and doctrine to the Gospel, is overwhelming. Mac-knight⁹¹ has drawn out a list of nineteen passages in the Epistle which are so similar to an equal number of passages in the Gospel that we can not but conclude that the two writings emanated from the same mind, or that one author was a strangely successful copyist both of the words and of the sentiments of the other. The allusion again of the writer to himself is such as would suit St. John the Apostle, and very few but St. John (1 Ep. i. 1).

With regard to *the time* at which St. John wrote the Epistle, there is considerable diversity of opinion. Many fix a date previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, understanding (but probably not correctly) the expression "It is the last time" (ii. 18) to refer to the Jewish Church and nation. Others, with more probability, assign it to the close of the first century. There are several indications of the Epistle being posterior to the Gospel. Like the Gospel it was probably written from Ephesus. It was primarily meant for the Churches of Asia under St. John's inspection, to whom he had already orally delivered his doctrine (i. 3, ii. 7).

The main *object* of the Epistle does not appear to be that of opposing errors, as many have supposed. The leading purpose of the Apostle appears to be rather constructive than polemical. St. John is remarkable both in his history and in his writings for his abhorrence of false doctrine, but he does not attack error as a controversialist. He states the deep truth and lays down the deep moral teaching of Christianity, and in this way, rather than directly, condemns heresy. In the introduction (i. 1-4) the Apostle states the purport of his Epistle. It is to declare the Word of life to those whom he is addressing, in order that he and they might be united in true communion with each other, and with God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ. He at once begins to explain the nature and conditions of communion with God, and being led on from this point into other topics, he twice brings himself back to the same subject. The first part of the Epistle may be considered to end at ii. 28. The Apostle begins afresh with the doctrine of sonship or communion at ii. 29, and returns to the same theme at iv. 7. His lesson throughout is, that the means of union with God are, on the part of Christ, his atoning blood (i. 7, ii. 2, iii. 5, iv. 10, 14, v. 6) and advocacy (ii. 1)—on the part of man, holiness (i. 6), obedience (ii. 3), purity (iii. 3), faith (iii. 23, iv. 3, v. 5), and above all love (ii. 7, iii. 14, iv. 7, v. 1). St. John is designated the Apostle of Love, and rightly; but it should be ever remembered that his "Love" does not exclude or ignore, but embraces, both faith and obedience as constituent parts of itself. Indeed, St. Paul's "Faith that worketh by Love," and St. James's "Works that are the fruit of Faith," and St. John's "Love which springs from Faith and produces Obedience," are all one and the same state of mind, described according to the first, third, or second stage into which we are able to analyze the complex whole.

There are two doubtful passages in this Epistle, ii. 23, "but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also," and v. 7, "For there are three

⁹¹ *Preface to the First Epistle of John.*

that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." It would appear without doubt that they are not genuine.

SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES.—The evidence of antiquity in favor of their authenticity is not complete, but yet it is considerable. If the external testimony is not as decisive as we might wish, the internal evidence is peculiarly strong. It has been pointed out that of the thirteen verses which compose the Second Epistle, eight are to be found in the First Epistle. Either, then, the Second Epistle proceeded from the same author as the First, or from a conscious fabricator who desired to pass off something of his own as the production of St. John. But if the latter alternative had been true, the fabricator in question would assuredly have assumed the title of *John the Apostle*, instead of merely designating himself as *The Elder*, and he would have introduced some doctrine which it would have been his object to make popular. The title and contents of the Epistle are strong arguments against a fabricator, whereas they would account for its non-universal reception in early times. And if not the work of a fabricator, it must, from style, diction, and tone of thought, be the work of the author of the First Epistle and, we may add, of the Gospel.

The reason why St. John designates himself as "Elder" rather than "Apostle" (2 Ep. 1, 3 Ep. 1), is no doubt the same as that which made St. Peter designate himself by the same title,⁹² and which caused St. James and St. Jude to give themselves no other title than "the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ,"⁹³ "the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James."⁹⁴ St. Paul had a special object in declaring himself an Apostle. Those who belonged to the original Twelve had no such necessity imposed upon them. With them it was a matter of indifference whether they employed the name of Apostle, like St. Peter,⁹⁵ or adopted an appellation which they shared with others, like St. John and St. James and St. Jude.

The Second Epistle is *addressed* ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ. An individual woman, who had children and a sister and nieces, is clearly indicated. Whether her name is given, and if so, what it is, has been doubted. According to one interpretation she is "the Lady Electa," to another, "the elect Kyria," to a third, "the elect Lady." The third is the rendering of the English version, which is probably the most correct.

The Third Epistle is *addressed* to Gaius or Caius. He was probably a convert of St. John (iii. 4), and a layman of wealth and distinction (3 Ep. 5) in some city near Ephesus.

The *object* of St. John in writing the Second Epistle was to warn the lady to whom he wrote against abetting the teaching known as that of Basilides and his followers, by an undue kindness perhaps displayed by her toward the preachers of the false doctrine. After the introductory salutation, the Apostle at once urges on his correspondent the great principle of Love, which with him (as we have before seen) means right affection springing from right faith and issuing in right conduct. The immediate consequence of the possession of this Love is the abhorrence of heretical misbelief, because the latter, being incompatible with right faith, is destructive of the producing cause of Love, and therefore of Love itself. This is the secret of St. John's strong denunciation of the "deceiver" whom he designates as "Antichrist." Love is with him the essence of Christianity; but Love

⁹² 1 Pet. v. 1.⁹³ James i. 1.⁹⁴ Jude 1.⁹⁵ 1 Pet. i. 1. 2 Pet. i. 1.

can spring only from right faith. Wrong belief therefore destroys Love, and with it Christianity. Therefore, says he, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds" (2 Ep. 10, 11).

The Third Epistle was written for the purpose of commending to the kindness and hospitality of Gaius some Christians who were strangers in the place where he lived. It is probable that these Christians carried this letter with them to Gaius as their introduction. It would appear that the object of the travelers was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles without money and without price (3 Ep. 7). St. John had already written to the ecclesiastical authorities of the place; but they, at the instigation of Diotrophes, had refused to receive the missionary brethren, whom therefore the Apostle now commends to the care of a layman. It is probable that Diotrophes was a leading presbyter who held Judaizing views, and would not give assistance to men who were going about with the purpose of preaching solely to the Gentiles. Whether Demetrius (ver. 12) was a tolerant presbyter of the same community, whose example St. John holds up as worthy of commendation in contradistinction to that of Diotrophes, or whether he was one of the strangers who bore the letter, we are now unable to determine. The latter supposition is the more probable.

We may conjecture that the two Epistles were written shortly after the First Epistle, from Ephesus. They both apply to individual cases of conduct the principles which had been laid down in their fullness in the First Epistle.

The title Catholic does not properly belong to the Second and Third Epistles. It became attached to them, although addressed to individuals, because they were of too little importance to be classed by themselves, and, so far as doctrine went, were regarded as appendices to the First Epistle.

§ 14. THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.—The writer of this Epistle styles himself, ver. 1, "Jude the brother of James," and has been usually identified with the Apostle Judas Lebbæus or Thaddæus.⁹⁶ But there are strong reasons for rendering the words "Judas the son of James:" and inasmuch as the author appears (ver. 17) to distinguish himself from the Apostles, we may agree with eminent critics in attributing the Epistle to another author. The most probable conclusion is that the author was Jude, one of the brethren of Jesus, and brother of James, not the Apostle the son of Alphæus, but the bishop of Jerusalem.

As to the time and place at which it was written, all is conjecture. The author being not absolutely certain, there are no external grounds for deciding the point; and the internal evidence is but small.

Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so-called *Antilegomena*, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the Church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. The question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the Canon. This question was gradually decided in its favor.

The *object* of the Epistle is plainly enough announced, ver. 3: the reason for this exhortation is given ver. 4. The remainder of the Epistle is almost entirely occupied by a minute depiction of the adversaries of the

⁹⁶ Luke vi. 16.

faith. The Epistle closes by briefly reminding the readers of the oft-repeated prediction of the Apostles—among whom the writer seems not to rank himself—that the faith would be assailed by such enemies as he has depicted (ver. 17-19), exhorting them to maintain their own steadfastness in the faith (ver. 20, 21), while they earnestly sought to rescue others from the correct example of those licentious livers (ver. 22, 23), and commending them to the power of God in language which forcibly recalls the closing benediction of the Epistle to the Romans (ver. 24, 25).⁹⁷ This Epistle presents one peculiarity, which, as we learn from St. Jerome, caused its authority to be impugned in very early times—the supposed citation of apocryphal writings (ver. 9, 14, 15). The former of these passages, containing the reference to the contest of the archangel Michael and the devil “about the body of Moses,” was supposed by Origen to have been founded on a Jewish work called the “Assumption of Moses.” As regards the supposed quotation from the Book of Enoch, the question is not so clear whether St. Jude is making a citation from a work already in the hands of his readers, or is employing a traditional prophecy not at that time committed to writing.

It has been already mentioned that the larger portion of this Epistle (ver. 3-16) is almost identical in language and subject with a part of the Second Epistle of Peter.⁹⁸

IV. THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.

§ 15. The word Revelation is the translation of the Greek title of the book *Apokalypsis* (Ἀποκάλυψις), that is, “uncovering” or “unveiling.”

(1.) *Canonical Authority and Authorship.*—The question as to the canonical authority of the Revelation resolves itself into a question of authorship. If it can be proved that a book, claiming so distinctly as this does the authority of divine inspiration, was actually written by St. John the Apostle, then no doubt will be entertained as to its title to a place in the Canon of Scripture. The evidence in favor of St. John's authorship consists of (i.) the assertions of the author, and (ii.) historical tradition.

(i.) The author's description of himself in the 1st and 22d chapters is certainly equivalent to an assertion that he is the Apostle. (a) He names himself simply JOHN, without prefix or addition—a name which at that period, and in Asia, must have been taken by every Christian as the designation, in the first instance, of the great Apostle who dwelt at Ephesus. He is also described as (b) a servant of Christ, (c) one who had borne testimony as an eye-witness of the Word of God and of the testimony of Christ—terms which were surely designed to identify him with the writer of the verses John xix. 35, i. 14, and 1 John i. 2. He is (d) in Patmos for the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ: it may be easy to suppose that other Christians of the same name were banished thither, but the Apostle is the only John who is distinctly named in early history as an exile at Patmos. He is also (e) a fellow-sufferer with those whom he addresses, and (f) the authorized channel of the most direct and important communication that was ever made to the Seven Churches of Asia, of which churches John the Apostle was at that time the spiritual governor and teacher. Lastly, (g) the writer was a fellow-servant of angels and a brother of prophets—

⁹⁷ Cf. Rom. xvi. 25-27.

⁹⁸ 2 Pet. ii. 1-19.

titles which are far more suitable to one of the chief Apostles, and far more likely to have been assigned to him, than to any other man of less distinction. All these marks are found united together in the Apostle John, and in him alone of all historical persons. We must go out of the region of fact into the region of conjecture to find such another person. A candid reader of the Revelation, if previously acquainted with St. John's other writings and life, must inevitably conclude that the writer intended to be identified with St. John. Unless we are prepared to give up the veracity and divine origin of the whole book, and to treat the writer's account of himself as a mere fiction of a poet trying to cover his own insignificance with an honored name, we must accept that description as a plain statement of fact, equally credible with the rest of the book, and in harmony with the simple, honest, truthful character which is stamped on the face of the whole narrative. Besides this direct assertion of St. John's authorship, there is also an implication of it running through the book. Generally, the instinct of single-minded, patient, faithful students has led them to recognize not merely the same Spirit as the source of this and other books of Holy Scripture, but also the same peculiarly-formed human instrument employed both in producing this book and the fourth Gospel, and in speaking the characteristic words and performing the characteristic actions recorded of St. John.

(ii.) The historical testimonies in favor of St. John's authorship begin with Justin Martyr (A.D. 150); but Jerome states that the Greek Churches felt, with respect to the Revelation, a similar doubt to that of the Latins respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews.⁹⁹

(2.) *Time and Place of Writing.*—The date of the Revelation is given by the great majority of critics as A.D. 95-97. The weighty testimony of Irenæus is almost sufficient to prevent any other conclusion. He says: "It (i. e., the Revelation) was seen no very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the close of Domitian's reign. Eusebius also records that, in the persecution under Domitian, John the Apostle and Evangelist was banished to the island of Patmos for his testimony of the divine Word. There is no mention in any writer of the first three centuries of any other time or place. Unsupported by any historical evidence, some commentators have put forth the conjecture that the Revelation was written as early as the time of Nero. This is simply their inference from the style and contents of the book, and is connected with a theory of the early fulfillment of its chief prophecies. It has been inferred from i. 2, 9, 10, that the Revelation was written in Ephesus, immediately after the Apostle's return from Patmos. But the style in which the messages to the Seven Churches are delivered rather suggests the notion that the book was written in Patmos.

(3.) *Contents.*—The first three verses contain the title of the book, the description of the writer, and the blessing pronounced on the readers, which possibly, like the last two verses of the fourth Gospel, may be an addition by the hand of inspired survivors of the writer. John begins (i. 4) with a salutation to the Seven Churches of Asia. This, coming before the announcement that he was in the Spirit, looks like a dedication not merely of the first vision, but of all the book, to those churches. In the next five verses (i. 5-9) he touches the key-note of the whole following book, the great fundamental ideas on which all our notions of the government of the

⁹⁹ The authorities on the subject are given in the *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii. p. 1035.

world and the Church are built; the Person of Christ, the redemption wrought by him, his second coming to judge mankind, the painful, hopeful discipline of Christians in the midst of this present world: thoughts which may well be supposed to have been uppermost in the mind of the persecuted and exiled Apostle even before the Divine Inspiration came on him.

(a.) The first vision shows the Son of Man with His injunction, or Epistles, to the Seven Churches. While the Apostle is pondering those great truths and the critical condition of the churches which he had left, a Divine Person, resembling those seen by Ezekiel and Daniel, and identified by name and by description as Jesus, appears to John, and, with the discriminating authority of a Lord and Judge, reviews the state of those churches, pronounces his decision upon their several characters, and takes occasion from them to speak to all Christians who may deserve similar encouragement or similar condemnation. Each of these sentences, spoken by the Son of Man, is described as said by the Spirit. Hitherto the Apostle has been speaking primarily, though not exclusively, to some of his own contemporaries concerning the present events and circumstances. Henceforth he ceases to address them particularly. His words are for the ear of the universal Church in all ages, and show the significance of things which are present in hope or fear, in sorrow or in joy, to Christians everywhere (i. 7-iii. 22).

(b.) In the next vision, Patmos and the Divine Person whom he saw are gone. Only the trumpet voice is heard again calling the seer to a change of place. He is in the highest court of heaven, and sees God sitting on his throne. The seven-sealed book or roll is produced, and the slain Lamb, the Redeemer, receives it amid the sound of universal adoration. As the seals are opened in order, the Apostle sees (1) a conqueror on a white horse, (2) a red horse betokening war, (3) the black horse of famine, (4) the pale horse of death, (5) the eager souls of martyrs under the altar, (6) an earthquake with universal commotion and terror. After this there is a pause, the course of avenging angels is checked, while 144,000, the children of Israel, servants of God, are sealed, and an innumerable multitude of the redeemed of all nations are seen worshiping God. Next (7) the seventh seal is opened, and half an hour's silence in heaven ensues (v. 1-viii. 1).

(c.) Then seven angels appear with trumpets, the prayers of saints are offered up, the earth is struck with fire from the altar, and the seven trumpets are sounded. (1) The earth and (2) the sea and (3) the springs of water and (4) the heavenly bodies are successively smitten, (5) a plague of locusts afflicts the men who are not sealed (the first woe), (6) the third part of men are slain (the second woe), but the rest are impenitent. Then there is a pause; a mighty angel with a book appears and cries out, seven thunders sound, but their words are not recorded, the approaching completion of the mystery of God is announced, the angel bids the Apostle eat the book, and measure the temple, with its worshipers, and the outer court given up to the Gentiles; the two witnesses of God, their martyrdom, resurrection, ascension, are foretold. The approach of the third woe is announced and (7) the seventh trumpet is sounded, the reign of Christ is proclaimed, God has taken his great power, the time has come for judgment and for the destruction of the destroyers of the earth (viii. 2-xi. 19).

The three preceding visions are distinct from one another. Each of the last two, like the longer one which follows, has the appearance of a distinct

prophecy, reaching from the prophet's time to the end of the world. The second half of the Revelation (xii.-xxii.) comprises a series of visions which are connected by various links. It may be described generally as a prophecy of the assaults of the devil (the dragon) and his agents (the ten-horned beast, the two-horned beast or false prophet, and the harlot) upon the Church, and their final destruction. It appears to begin with a reference to events anterior, not only to those which are predicted in the preceding chapter, but also to the time in which it was written. It seems hard to interpret the birth of the child as a prediction, and not as a retrospective allusion.

(*d.*) A woman clothed with the sun is seen in heaven, and a great red dragon, with seven crowned heads, stands waiting to devour her offspring; her child is caught up unto God, and the mother flees into the wilderness for 1260 days. The persecution of the woman and her seed is described as the consequence of a war in heaven, in which the dragon was overcome and cast out upon the earth (xii.).

St. John, standing on the sea-shore, sees a beast with seven heads, one wounded, with ten crowned horns, rising from the water, as the representative of the dragon. All the world wonder at and worship him, and he attacks the saints and prevails. He is followed by another two-horned beast rising out of the earth, who compels men to wear the mark of the beast, whose number is 666 (xiii.).

St. John sees the Lamb, with the 144,000 who are standing on Mount Zion and learning the song of praise of the heavenly host. Three angels fly forth calling men to worship God, proclaiming the fall of Babylon, and denouncing the worshipers of the beast. A blessing is pronounced on the faithful dead, and the judgment of the world is described under the image of a harvest reaped by angels (xiv.).

St. John sees in heaven the saints who had overcome the beast, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Then seven angels come out of the heavenly temple, having seven vials of wrath, which they pour out upon the earth, sea, rivers, sun, the seat of the beast, Euphrates, and the air, after which there is a great earthquake and a hail-storm (xv., xvi.).

One of the last seven angels carries St. John into the wilderness, and shows him a harlot, Babylon, sitting on a scarlet beast with seven heads and ten horns. She is explained to be that great city, sitting upon seven mountains, reigning over the kings of the earth. Afterward St. John sees a vision of the destruction of Babylon, portrayed as the burning of a great city, amid the lamentations of worldly men and the rejoicings of saints (xvii., xviii.).

Afterward the worshipers in heaven are heard celebrating Babylon's fall and the approaching marriage-supper of the Lamb. The Word of God is seen going forth to war at the head of the heavenly armies: the beast and his false prophet are taken and cast into the burning lake, and their worshipers are slain (xix.).

An angel binds the dragon, *i. e.*, the devil, for 1000 years, while the martyred saints who have not worshiped the beast reign with Christ. Then the devil is unloosed, gathers a host against the camp of the saints, but is overcome by fire from heaven, and is cast into the burning lake, with the beast and false prophet. St. John then witnesses the process of the final judgment, and sees and describes the new heaven and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem, with its people and their way of life (xx.-xxii. 5).

In the last sixteen verses the angel solemnly asseverates the truthfulness and importance of the foregoing sayings, pronounces a blessing on those who keep them exactly, gives warning of his speedy coming to judgment, and of the nearness of the time when these prophecies shall be fulfilled (xxii. 6-21).

(5.) *Interpretation.*—A short account of the different directions in which attempts have been made to interpret the Revelation, is all that can be given in this place. The special blessing promised to the reader of this book (i. 3), the assistance to common Christian experience afforded by its precepts and by some of its visions, the striking imagery of others, the tempting field which it supplies for intellectual exercise, will always attract students to this book and secure for it the labors of many commentators.

The interval between the Apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called the *Chiliastic* period of Apocalyptic interpretation. The visions of St. John were chiefly regarded as representations of general Christian truths, scarcely yet embodied in actual facts, for the most part to be exemplified or fulfilled in the reign of Antichrist, the coming of Christ, the Millennium, and the Day of Judgment. The fresh hopes of the early Christians, and the severe persecution they endured, taught them to live in those future events with intense satisfaction and comfort. They did not entertain the thought of building up a definite consecutive chronological scheme even of those symbols which some moderns regard as then already fulfilled; although from the beginning a connection between Rome and Antichrist was universally allowed, and parts of the Revelation were regarded as the filling-up of the great outline sketched by Daniel and St. Paul.

Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, the Christians, emancipated from oppression and persecution, and dominant and prosperous in their turn, began to lose their vivid expectation of our Lord's speedy Advent and their spiritual conception of his kingdom, and to look upon the temporal supremacy of Christianity as a fulfillment of the promised reign of Christ on earth. The Roman empire, become Christian, was regarded no longer as the object of prophetic denunciation, but as the scene of a millennial development. This view, however, was soon met by the figurative interpretation of the millennium, as the reign of Christ in the hearts of all true believers. As the barbarous and heretical invaders of the falling empire appeared, they were regarded by the suffering Christians as fulfilling the woes denounced in the Revelation. The beginning of a regular chronological interpretation is seen in Berengaud (assigned by some critics to the 9th century), who treated the Revelation as a history of the Church from the beginning of the world to its end. And the original Commentary of the Abbot Joachim is remarkable, not only for a further development of that method of interpretation, but for the scarcely disguised identification of Babylon with Papal Rome, and of the second Beast of Antichrist with some Universal Pontiff.

In the dawn of the Reformation, the views to which the reputation of Abbot Joachim had given currency were taken up by the harbingers of impending change, as by Wicliffe and others; and they became the foundation of that great historical school of interpretation, which up to this time seems the most popular of all. It is impossible to construct an exact classification of modern interpreters of the Revelation. They are generally placed in three great divisions.

(a.) The *Historical* or *Continuous* expositors, in whose opinion the Reve-

lation is a progressive history of the fortunes of the Church from the first century to the end of time.

(b.) The *Præterist* expositors, who are of opinion that the Revelation has been almost or altogether fulfilled in the time which has passed since it was written: that it refers principally to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and Paganism, signalized in the downfall of Jerusalem and of Rome. This is the favorite interpretation with the critics of Germany.

(c.) The *Futurist* expositors, whose views show a strong reaction against some extravagances of the two preceding schools. They believe that the whole book, excepting perhaps the first three chapters, refers principally, if not exclusively, to events which are yet to come.

Each of these three schemes is open to objection. Against the *Futurist* it is argued, that it is not consistent with the repeated declarations of a speedy fulfillment at the beginning and end of the book itself (see ch. i. 3; xxii. 6, 7, 12, 20). Christians, to whom it was originally addressed, would have derived no special comfort from it, had its fulfillment been altogether deferred for so many centuries. The rigidly literal interpretation of Babylon, the Jewish tribes, and other symbols, which generally forms a part of *Futurist* schemes, presents peculiar difficulties.

Against the *Præterist* expositors it is urged that prophecies fulfilled ought to be rendered so perspicuous to the general sense of the Church as to supply an argument against infidelity; that the destruction of Jerusalem, having occurred twenty-five years previously, could not occupy a large space in prophecy; that the supposed predictions of the downfall of Jerusalem and of Nero appear from the context to refer to one event, but are by this scheme separated, and moreover, placed in a wrong order; that the measuring of the temple and the altar, and the death of the two witnesses (ch. xi.), can not be explained consistently with the context.

Against the *Historical* scheme it is urged that its advocates differ very widely among themselves; that they assume without any authority that the 1260 days are so many years; that several of its applications—*e. g.*, of the symbol of the ten-horned beast to the Popes, and the sixth seal to the conversion of Constantine—are inconsistent with the context; that attempts by some of this school to predict future events by the help of the Revelation have ended in repeated failures.

In conclusion it may be stated that two methods have been proposed by which the student of the Revelation may escape the incongruities and fallacies of the different interpretations, while he may derive edification from whatever truth they contain. It has been suggested that the book may be regarded as a prophetic poem, dealing in general and unspecific descriptions, much of which may be set down as poetic imagery, mere embellishment. But such a view would be difficult to reconcile with the belief that the book is an inspired prophecy. A better suggestion is made, or rather revived, by Dr. Arnold in his *Sermons On the Interpretation of Prophecy*: that we should bear in mind that predictions have a lower historical sense, as well as a higher spiritual sense; that there may be more than one typical, imperfect, historical fulfillment of a prophecy, in each of which the higher spiritual fulfillment is shadowed forth more or less distinctly. The recognition of this would pave the way for the acceptance in a modified sense of many of the interpretations of the *Historical* school, and would not exclude the most valuable portions of the other schemes.

APPENDIX II.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES OF NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY.

INCLUDING THE

CONNECTION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

For the sake of greater completeness, these Tables begin with the *Return from the Captivity*, thus repeating the last section of the *Tables of Old Testament History*, but in a more condensed form. S signifies a Sabbatic year.

TABLE I.—THE PERSIAN DOMINATION.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | PERSIA. | GREECE AND MAUR-
DONIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|-------|--|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|
| | | Years. | | | |
| 536 | Return of first caravan under Zerubabel, prince, and 1. JESHUA, High-priest. | CYRUS
Edict for the return of the Jews. | 1 | | 218 |
| 535 | Rebuilding of the Temple begun. | 2 | Thespis first exhibited tragedy. | | 219 |
| S 534 | Opposition of Samaritans. | Daniel x.-xii. | 3 | TARQUINIUS SUPERBUS. | 220 |
| 529 | Letter to the Persian king from the adversaries. | CAMBYSES (the Ahasuerus of Ezra iv. 6. Artaxerxes in Ezra iv. 7). | 1 | | 225 |
| 525 | | Conquest of Egypt. | 4 | 527. Death of Pisistratus. | 227 |
| 523 | The building stopped by a royal decree. | The PSEUDO-SMERDIS (the Magian Gomates). | Death of Polycrates of Samos. | | 229 |
| 521 | Haggai and Zechariah. | DARIUS I., son of Hystaspes, confirms the edict of Cyrus. | 1 | | 232 |
| S 520 | Building resumed. | 2 | | | 233 |
| 515 | Temple dedicated. | 7 | | | 234 |
| 514 | | Attacks India and European Scythia. | 8 | Hipparchus slain. | 240 |
| 510 | | 12 | Hippias expelled. | Kings expelled. Republic of Rome. | 244 |
| 493 | | Ionian revolt | 28 | Republic of Athens. | 255 |
| 495 | | 27 | | Patricians oppress Plebeians. | 259 |
| 494 | | | | Secession to the Sacred Mt. | 260 |
| 490 | | 82 | Marathon. | Tribunes and Ediles of Plebs. | |
| 486 | | XERXES (the Ahasuerus of Esther). | 1 | | |
| 480 | | 7 | Salamis. | | |
| 479 | | 8 | Platæa and Mycale. | Wars with Italians. | |
| 476 | | 11 | Cimon. | | 258 |
| 474 | | Esther and Mordecai | | | |
| 465 | | 21 | Battles of the Eurymedon. | | 258 |
| 465 | 2. ELIASHIB, H.-P. (date uncertain). | ARTAXERXES I. | 1 | | 289 |
| 460 | | LONGIMANUS. | | | |
| | | Revolt of Inaros in Egypt. | 6 | Athenians in Egypt. | 294 |
| 458 | Commission of Ezra | 7 | | | 296 |
| S 457 | Great reformation. | 8 | | | 297 |
| 454 | | Egypt conquered. | 12 | Pericles. | 300 |
| | | | | Patricians yield to Plebs. | |

TABLE I.—THE PERSIAN DOMINATION—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | PERSIA. | GREECE AND MACE-
DONIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|--------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|------------|
| | | Years. | | | |
| 451 | | 16 | | Laws of the XII.
Tables. | 303 |
| 449 | | 17 | | Decemvirs deposed | 305 |
| 445 | | 21 | | Tribuni Militum... | 309 |
| 444 | Commission of Ne-
hemiah. | 22 | 444. Herodotus. | | 310 |
| to | The walls rebuilt. | | | | |
| | Reading of the Law | | | | |
| 433 | Opposition of San-
ballat. | 33 | | | |
| 431 | | 35 | 431. Peloponnesian
war. | | 323 |
| 428 | Second commission | 38 | | 426. War with Vell. | 328 |
| or 423 | of Nehemiah. | 425. XERXES II.
SOGDIANUS. | | | 329 |
| 424 | 3. JOLADA, H.-P.
(date uncertain).
Samaritan Temple
on Mount Gerizim? | DARIUS II.: No-
thus. | 1 | | 330 |
| 405 | | ARTAXERXES II.
(Mnemon). | 1 | | 349 |
| S 401 | | Expedition of
Cyrus the younger | 5 | 404. End of Ditto..
Xenophon | 350
353 |
| 400 | Malachi, Prophet. | 6 | Retreat of the 10,000 | | 354 |
| about | O. T. Canon fixed. | 7 | Death of Socrates. | | 355 |
| 399 | | 10 | Agessilaus in Asia. | Camillus takes Veil | 358 |
| 396 | | 12 | Battle of Coronea. | | 360 |
| S 394 | | 16 | | Gauls take Rome. | 364 |
| 390 | | 17 | Peace of Antalcidas | | 367 |
| S 387 | | 24 | Olynthian War....
Demosthenes born. | | 372 |
| 382 | 4. JOHANAN, H.-P.
(or Jonathan). | 27 | Rise of Theban
power. | | 375 |
| 379 | | 30 | | Licinian Rogations
passed. | 387 |
| 367 | Murder of Joshua. | 44 | Battle of Mantinea | | 392 |
| about | | Revolt of Tachos | 45 Agessilaus in Egypt | Galic Invasion | 393 |
| 362 | | In Egypt. | | | |
| 361 | | Artaxerxes dies | 47 Accession of PHILIP
II., king of Mace-
donia. | | 395 |
| S 359 | | OCHUS | 1 | | |
| 357 | | 3 | The Social War.... | | 397 |
| 356 | | 4 | Alexander born.... | First Plebeian Dic-
tator | 398 |
| 351 | Alleged captivity of
Jews. | Revolt of the Si-
donians. | 9 | First Plebeian Cen-
sor. | 399 |
| 350 | 5. JADDUA, H.-P.
(last name in O.T). | 10 | | | 404 |
| 348 | | 17 | | First Samnite War | 411 |
| 347 | | 20 | | Latin War. Decius | 414 |
| S 338 | | ARSES | 1 Philip chosen gene-
ral of the Greeks
at Corinth. | | 416 |
| 336 | | War declared by
the Greeks. | 1 | | |
| 334 | | DARIUS III.
(Codomanus). | Murder of Philip...
ALEXANDER THE
GREAT. | | 418 |
| 333 | | Invasion of Alex-
ander. | 3 | | 420 |
| 332 | Interview with Al-
exander? | 4 | Battle of Issus | | 421 |
| S 331 | Settlement of Jews
at Alexandria. | 5 | Taking of Tyre
Alexandria built. | 5 Alexander, king of
Epirus in Italy | 422 |
| 330 | 6. ONIAS I. H.-P | 6 | Battle of Arbela | | 423 |
| | | Murder of Darius.. | Demosthenes de
Corona? | 7 | 424 |

TABLE II.—THE HELLENISTIC DOMINATION.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|-------|--|--|--|--|--------|
| 330 | 6. ONIAS I. H.-P. | Empire of Alexander..... 7 | | | 424 |
| 326 | | Alexander returns from India..... 11 | | Second Samnite War | 418 |
| 323 | | Death of Alexander at Babylon..... 14 | | | 431 |
| 320 | Ptolemy takes Jerusalem. | PTOLEMY I., Soter.. | Contests of the Diadochi in Asia and Europe. | | |
| | Settlements of Jews at Alexandria, in Egypt and Cyrene. | | | | |
| 314 | Palestine under Antigonius. | | | | 440 |
| 312 | [Era of the Seleucidæ.] | | 1. SELEUCUS I. Nicator. | Appius Claudius censor. | 442 |
| 309 | Death of Onias I. (Jos.) | | | | 445 |
| 301 | War of the Diadochi ended by the battle of Ipsus in Phrygia. | | | | 453 |
| | Palestine subject to Egypt till A.D. 198. | | | | |
| 300 | Death of Onias I. (Eus.) | | Jews settle in Syria | | 454 |
| | 7. SIMON I., the Just, H.-P. | | | | |
| 298 | Canon of SS. completed? | | | Third Samnite War | 456 |
| 292 | 8. ELEAZAR, H.-P. | | | Defeat of the Samnites. | 462 |
| 285 | Progress of the Egyptian Jews. | 2. PTOLEMY II. Philadelphus (with his father). | | [Greece. Ætolian, and Achæan Leagues.] | 469 |
| 283 | Version of the LXX? [N.B. The dates of the High-Priests down to Onias III. are very doubtful.] | Ptolemy II. alone.. | | Gauls and Etruscans defeated. | 471 |
| 281 | | Splendor of Egypt | Selencus murdered. | Pyrrhus in Italy... | 473 |
| 280 | | | 2. ANTIOCHUS I. Soter | War with Pyrrhus | 474 |
| 264 | | | | First Punic War... | 490 |
| S 261 | | The historian Manetho, fl. | 3. ANTIOCHUS II. Theos. | [Greece: Growth of Achæan League. | 493 |
| 251 | 9. MANASSEH, H.-P. | | Revolt of Parthia... | Aratus and Philopomen.] | 503 |
| 250 | | | Era of the Arsacidæ | Metellus in Sicily. | 504 |
| S 247 | | 3. PTOLEMY III. Euergetes. | Berosus: historian of Babylon, fl. | Hamilcar Barca... | 507 |
| 246 | | War with Syria. | 4. SELEUCUS II. Callinicus. | | 508 |
| 241 | | Friendly relations with Judæa interrupted. | Disastrous wars with Egypt and Parthia. | Peace with Carthage | 513 |
| S 240 | 10. ONIAS II. H.-P. Refuses Tribute. Joseph, son of Tobias. | | | | 514 |
| S 226 | 11. SIMON II. H.-P. | | 236. Seleucus taken prisoner by the Parthians. | | |
| 223 | | | 5. SELEUCUS III. Ceraunus. | | 538 |
| 222 | | | 6. ANTIOCHUS III. the Great. | | 531 |
| | | 4. PTOLEMY IV. Philopator. | Quells revolt in Media. | | 532 |
| S 219 | Antiochus overruns Palestine. | | Makes war in Egypt | Second Punic War. | 535 |
| 217 | Ptolemy recovers Palestine, profanes the Temple, but is driven out supernaturally. | Victory over Antiochus. Persecutes the Jews of Alexandria. | Defeat at Raphia .. | Battle of Trasimene | 537 |
| | | | The Jews incline toward Syria. | | |

TABLE II.—THE HELLENISTIC DOMINATION—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|-------|--|---|--|--|------------|
| 216 | | | | Battle of Cannæ.... | 538 |
| S 205 | The Jews submit to Antiochus the Great, and are at first well treated. | 5. PROLEMY V. Epiphanes (5 years old.) | Renews the war against Egypt. | | 549 |
| 201 | | War with Syria.... | Many Jews transplanted from Babylonia to Asia Minor. | 204. Scipio in Africa
Peace with Carthage | 550
553 |
| 200 | | His general Scopas treats the Jews ill. | | War with Phillip V. | 554 |
| S 198 | 12. ONIAS III. H.-P. | | Victory at Panium over the Egyptians. | | 556 |
| 197 | Palestine and Coele-Syria conquered by Antiochus, and confirmed to him by the peace with Rome. | | | Ended by the Battle of Cynoscephalæ. | 557 |
| S 191 | | Ptolemy marries Cleopatra, the daughter of Antiochus. | Defeated at Thermopylæ. | War with Antiochus | 563 |
| 190 | | | And at Magnesia in Asia. | The Scipios in Asia | 564 |
| 183 | | | Peace with Rome... | Antiochus retires within the Taurus. | 566 |
| 187 | Attempt of Heliodorus to plunder the Temple? | | 7. SELEUCUS IV. Philopator. | | 567 |
| 181 | | 6. PROLEMY VI. Philometor (a minor), under his mother and tutors. | Demetrius sent to Rome. | War in Spain..... | 573 |
| 175 | Onias III. deposed, and the priesthood sold to JASON (Joshua), H.-P. | Great internal dissensions. | 8. ANTIOCHUS IV. Epiphanes (Epimanes).
Onias at Antioch; murdered by the contrivance of Menelaus (171). | | 579 |
| 172 | MENELAUS (Onias), H.-P. | | | | 582 |
| 171 | Hellenism rampant. | Egypt invaded by Antiochus, who is ordered out by the Romans. | | Macedonian War... | 583 |
| 168 | Menelaus deposed.. Massacre at Jerusalem. Martyrdom of Eleazar and others. Revolt of MATTATHIAS. | Joint reign of Ptolemy and his brother Physcon. The latter receives Cyrene and Libya (163). | Expulsion from Egypt.
Persecution of the Jews.
Judea revolts under the Maccabees. | Battle of Pydna....
Perseus taken prisoner.
End of the Macedonian Kingdom. | 586 |
| 167 | | | Defeats of Syrian generals by Judas. | Polybius at Rome. | 587 |
| 166 | JUDAS MACCABÆUS. | | Antiochus in Babylonia. Dies (164). | Terence exhibits the <i>Andria</i> . | 588 |

TABLE III.—THE MACCABEES, AND ASMONÆAN KINGS.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|-------|--|---|--|--|--------|
| 168 | Revolt of MATTATHIAS.
ONIAS IV. titular H.-P. | Ptolemy VI. — <i>continued.</i> | Antiochus IV. — <i>continued.</i> | Macedonia conquered. | 596 |
| 167 | War against apostates. | Onias IV. flees to Egypt, and founds a temple at Leontopolis. | Judas defeats the Syrian generals. | | 587 |
| 166 | 1. JUDAS MACCABÆUS.
Dec. Rededication of the Temple. | | | | 588 |
| 164 | League of neighboring nations defeated.
Execution of Menelaus.
End of line of Jozadak. | | Battle of Bethsura. Judas takes Jerusalem.
Antiochus in Elymais.
Death of Antiochus. | | 590 |
| S 163 | Death of Eleazar Savaran. | Partition of the kingdom with Physcon. | 9. ANTIOCHUS V. Eupator takes Bethsura and besieges Jerusalem. Peace with the Jews. | | 591 |
| 162 | ALCIMUS (Jacimus) H.-P. set up by the Syrians. | | 10. DEMETRIUS I. Soter. | | 592 |
| 161 | Victory of Adasa.
Embassy to Rome.
Death of Judas.
2. JONATHAN APHUS.
Death of John the Maccabee.
Death of Alcimus. | | Defeat of Nicanor. Bacchides in Syria.
Battle of Eleasa.
Bacchides retires to Syria on the death of Alcimus. | Philosophers expelled.
Alliance with Judæa, inscribed on brass. | 593 |
| 158 | Peace with Syria. | | Returns and is defeated. | | 596 |
| 153 | Jonathan High-Priest. | | Revolt of Alexander Balas. | Celtiberian War. | 601 |
| 150 | Alliance with Balas. | Balas marries Ptolemy's daughter Cleopatra. | 11. ALEXANDER BALAS seizes the throne. | Galba in Spain | 604 |
| S 149 | Favors to Jerusalem. | | | Third Punic War. | 605 |
| 147 | Defeat of Apollonius. | Ptolemy sides with Demetrius against Balas. | Demetrius returns. | | 607 |
| 146 | Alliance with Demetrius, whose life Jonathan saves. | | 12. DEMETRIUS II. Nicator. | CARTHAGE and CORINTH destroyed. | 608 |
| 145 | | 7. PTOLEMY VII. Physcon, or Euergetes. | Tryphon sets up ANTIOCHUS VI., who overthrows Demetrius. | Africa and Greece become Roman Provinces. | 609 |
| 144 | Antiochus grants new honors to Jonathan and his brother Simon.
Jonathan taken and put to death by Tryphon. | | Tryphon at war with Jonathan. | War with Viriathus. | 610 |
| 143 | 3. SIMON THASSI, H.-P. | Embassy of Scipio. | TRYPHON kills Antiochus. | Q. Metellus in Spain. | 611 |
| S 142 | | | | | 612 |

TABLE III.—THE MACCABEES, AND ASMONÆAN KINGS—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|-------|--|--|--|---|---|
| 141 | Tower of Zion taken
<i>First year of Jewish freedom.</i> | | | | 613 |
| 140 | Simon made hereditary prince of the Jews. | | | | 614 |
| 138 | Prosperity of Judæa | | Demetrius prisoner to the Parthians. | Numantine War. | 616 |
| 137 | Recognized by Rome.
Receives from Antiochus VII. the privilege of coining money. | | 13. ANTIOCHUS VII. Sidetes. | | 617 |
| S 135 | Murder of Simon.
4. JOHN HYRCANUS, H.-P. | | Deposes Tryphon, and makes war on Simon. | | 619 |
| 133 | Surrenders Jerusalem. | | Grants peace to Hyrcanus. | Fall of Numantia. | 621 |
| 128 | Goes to Parthia with Antiochus.
<i>Judæa independent</i> | | Antiochus killed in Parthia.
DEMETRIUS II. released. | Death of Tib. Gracchus. | 626 |
| 125 | Hyrcanus conquers the land E. of Jordan, Idumæa and Samaria. | | 14. SELEUCTUS V.
15. ANTIOCHUS VIII. Grypus,
16. And ANTIOCHUS IX. Cyzicanus, rival kings. | | 629
630
632
633 |
| 117 | | 8. PTOLEMY VIII. Lathyrus (Soter).
Cyrene finally separated from Egypt. | | 111. Jugurthine War. | 643 |
| 109 | Destroys the Temple on Mount Gerizim.
Joins the Sadducees | | | | |
| 107 | | Driven to Cyprus by his mother CLEOPATRA, who reigns with her second son. | | | |
| 106 | Death of Hyrcanus.
5. ARISTOBULUS I., H.-P.
Assumes the title of king. | PTOLEMY IX. Alexander I.
[Great confusion to the end of the dynasty]. | | 106. Jugurtha taken. Cicero and Pompey born. | 648 |
| 105 | 6. ALEXANDER JANNEUS.
Conquest of Gaza, Moab, etc.
Civil war. | Judæa invaded by Ptolemy Lathyrus, rescued by Cleopatra. | | 102. Marius routes the Cimbri and Teutones.
100. C. Julius Cæsar born.
92. Sulla in Asia; receives a Parthian embassy.
90. Social War.
88. First Mithridatic War, and Civil War at Rome.
86. Death of Marius
82. Sulla Dictator.
74. Great Mithridatic War.
70. Mithridates flies to Armenia.
69. Lucullus defeats Tigranes. | 652
653
654
662
664
666
668
672
680
684
686 |
| 81 | | PTOLEMY X. Alexander II. | | | |
| 80 | | PTOLEMY XI. Dionysus, or Auletes. | | | |
| 78 | Dying reconciliation with the Pharisees.
7. ALEXANDRA (queen).
Hyrcanus II., H.-P. | | 23. TIGRANES, king of Armenia, reigns over Syria, till he is defeated by Lucullus, 69. | | |

TABLE III.—THE MACCABEES, AND ASMONÆAN KINGS—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|--|--|---|--------|
| 63 | 8. HYRCANUS II. (about 40) king, deposed by his brother after 3 months. | | 23. ANTIOCHUS XIII. last (nominal) king under Roman protection. | | 685 |
| | 9. ARISTOBULUS II. Rise of ANTIPATER. | | | | |
| 68 | Hyrcaus and Antipater fly to Aretas, king of Arabia. | | | 68. Success of Mithridates. | 686 |
| | | | | 67. War against the Pirates, Pompey general. | 687 |
| S 65 | Civil War of Hyrcanus and Antipater, aided by Aretas, against Aristobulus. | | 66. Scaurus at Damascus. Pompey deposes Antiochus. Syria a Roman province. | 66. Mithridatic War committed to Pompey. | 688 |
| | Scaurus in Judæa: hears the ambassadors of both brothers. | | | Defeats Mithridates in Armenia, and subdues Tigranes. | |
| | | | | 65. Levee of kings in Pontus. | 689 |
| | | | | Pompey in the Caucasian countries. | |
| 64 | Arbitration of Pompey. | | Pompey at Damascus. | Pompey returns to Syria. | 690 |
| 63 | He takes Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement (Sept. 22), and enters the Holy of Holies. | | Receives Jewish ambassadors. Roman Governors of Syria. | Cicero consul. | 691 |
| | HYRCANUS II. restored as H.-P. Antipater civil governor (procurator). Judæa subject to Rome from this time. | | 62. Æmilius Scaurus, Quæstor pro Prætor. | Conspiracy of Cataline. | |
| | | | 61. L. Marcus Philippus, Proprætor. | Birth of Augustus. | 692 |
| | | | | 62. Cæsar prætor. | |
| 59 | | Ptolemy Anuletes bribes Cæsar to obtain his acknowledgment as king. | Lentulus Marcellinus, Proprætor. | 61. Triumph of Pompey. | 693 |
| | | | | 60. Cæsar in Spain. First Triumvirate. | 694 |
| S 58 | | Ptolemy Anuletes expelled by his subjects. Goes to Rome. BERENICE and TRYPHÆNA reign during his absence. | | Cæsar consul. | 695 |
| | | | | Cæsar in Gaul. Cicero banished. | 696 |
| 57 | Successes of Alexander, son of Aristobulus II., against Hyrcanus. Defeated by Gabinus, proconsul of Syria. | | Gabinus, Proconsul. Syria is henceforth a consular province. | Cicero recalled. | 697 |
| | New Constitution: the Five Great Sanhedrims. | | | | |
| 56 | Re-appearance and defeat of Aristobulus II., and his son Antigonus. | | Expedition of Gabinus into Parthia. | Cæsar's first descent on Britain. | 699 |

TABLE III.—THE MACCABEES, AND ASMONÆAN KINGS—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|--|--|--|--------|
| 55 | New Insurrection of Alexander: his defeat at Mt. Tabor. | Gabinius in Egypt. Restores Ptolemy Auletes. | | | |
| 54 | Crassus at Jerusalem: plunders the Temple. | | Crassus, <i>Proconsul</i> . | Cæsar in Britain, the second time. | 700 |
| 53 | | | Slain by the Parthians.
Cassius <i>Quæstor</i> . | | 701 |
| 52 | Cassius enslaves 80,000 Jews — the partisans of Aristobulus. | | | Clodius slain by Milo. | 702 |
| 51 | | CLEOPATRA, with PROLEMY XII. and PROLEMY XIII. | Bibulus, <i>Proconsul</i> . | Cæsar finishes the conquest of Gaul. | 703 |
| 50 | | | [Scipio, Pompeian <i>Proconsul</i> .] | 50. Measures of Pompey against Cæsar. | 704 |
| 49 | Cæsar releases Aristobulus, who is murdered by the Pompeians. Alexander put to death by Scipio at Antioch. | | | <i>Civil war begins.</i> Cæsar enters Italy. Flight of Pompey to Greece. | 705 |
| 48 | Antipater aids Cæsar, who makes him a citizen and 1st <i>Procurator of Judæa</i> , with Hyrcanus as <i>Ethnarch</i> . | Cæsar in Egypt. Alexandrine war—ends in Jan. B.C. 47 (March 27, Old Calendar). | | Cæsar in Spain against the Pompeians. Battle of Pharsalia. Pompey killed in Egypt. | 706 |
| 47 | Immunities granted to the Jews. Antipater escorts Cæsar to Pontus. | | Sex. Julius Cæsar. C.J. Cæsar in Syria. | War with Pharnaces. Cæsar Dictator. | 707 |
| 46 | Appoints his sons, Phasaël and Herod, captains of Judæa and Galilee. | | Q. Cæcilius Bassus, <i>Prætor</i> . | African War. <i>The Calendar reformed.</i> | 708 |
| 45 | Herod hostile to Hyrcanus. | | | War in Spain. | 709 |
| 44 | Decree of Cæsar for refortifying Jerusalem. | | | DEATH OF CÆSAR. | 710 |
| 43 | Cassius plunders Jerusalem. Antipater poisoned. Herod visits Jerusalem. | | C. Cassius Longinus, <i>Proconsul</i> , arrives in Syria. [NOTE. All the subsequent governors are <i>Legati</i> .] | War of Mutina. <i>Second Triumvirate.</i> | 711 |
| 42 | Herod defeats Antigonus, and enters Jerusalem in triumph. Is reconciled to Hyrcanus and betrothed to Mariamne. | Antony in Asia. Meets Cleopatra at Tarsus, and goes to Egypt. | | Battles of Philippi. | 712 |
| 41 | Herod gains favor with Antony. | | L. Decidius Saxa, <i>Legatus</i> . | War of Perugia | 713 |
| 40 | 10. ANTIGONUS set up by the Parthians. | Antony goes to Tyre on his way against the Parthians; thence to Athens. | Invasion of the Parthians under Pacorus and Labienus. | Perusia taken. Agrippa sent against Antony. | 714 |

TABLE III.—THE MACCABEES, AND ASMONÆAN KINGS—continued

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|--|---|--|--------|
| 40 | Phasaël put to death, and Hyrcanus mutilated.
HEROD escapes to Rome, gains over the triumvirs, and is appointed by the Senate King of Judæa about the end of the year. [Hence to his death in B. C. 4, Josephus reckons his reign 37 years.] | Leagues with Sex. Pompey, and besieges Brundisium. Receives the Eastern Provinces. | The legate Saxe slain.
P. Ventidius Bassus, <i>Legatus</i> , sent against them by Antony. | Death of Fulvia.
Reconciliation of Octavian and Antony at Brundisium.
The empire divided. Antony and Octavian at Rome. | 714 |
| 39 | Herod returns, collects an army, and unites with Silo, who deserts his cause.
Conquers Galilee. | Antony marries Octavia, goes to Greece, and spends the winter at Athens. | The Parthians are defeated, and Labienus slain.
Ventidius recovers Syria.
Is bribed by Antigonus. | Conference at Misenum between Octavian, Antony, and Sex. Pompey. | 715 |
| 38 | Silo joins Ventidius. Ventidius sends aid to Herod.
Herod marches to join Antony.
His brother Joseph slain by Antigonus.
Herod at Acre. | Antony joins Ventidius after his victory, and besieges Samosata; receives Herod there. Thence returns to Athens, leaving Sosius as his legate. | Great victory of Ventidius over the Parthians; Pacorus slain.
Ventidius returns to Rome and triumphs.
C. Sosius, <i>Legatus</i> , sends aid to Herod. | War between Octavian and Sex. Pompey.
Agrippa commands the fleet. | 716 |
| 37 | Herod marches against Jerusalem in the Spring.
Marries Mariamne.
Is joined by Sosius, and takes Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement, Oct. 5, and on a Sabbath.
Death of Antigonus.
End of the Asmonæan line. | Antony in Italy. Returns by way of Greece, parting from Octavia at Coreyra. | Antony at Antioch, at the close of the year, where he condemns Antigonus to death by scourging and beheading. | Renewal of the triumvirate for five years.
Preparations of Octavian against Sex. Pompey. | 717 |

TABLE IV.—KINGDOM OF HEROD THE GREAT, SUBJECT TO AND UNDER THE PROTECTION OF ROME.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|--|--|---|--------|
| 37 | HEROD THE GREAT 1.
His actual reign dates by Consular years from Jan. 1, or by Jewish sacred years from the first of Nisan. | | | See Table III. | 717 |
| 36 | Ananel made H.-P.
Herod.....2
Hyrceanus comes from Babylon to Jerusalem. His daughter Alexandra seeks the High-priesthood from Cleopatra for her son Aristobulus. Herod deposes Ananel, and appoints ARISTOBULUS II.-P. | Antony sends for Cleopatra, and gives her Phœnicia, Crete, etc.
Antony marches against the Parthians.
Cleopatra meets Herod in Judæa.
Antony retires to Egypt. | Antony in Syria. | Naval war against Sextus Pompey. The latter, defeated, retires to Lesbos, and seeks aid from Antony, but is disappointed. | 718 |
| 35 | Herod.....3
Aristobulus (set. 17) warmly received at the Feast of Tabernacles, and drowned soon after (Sept. 19).
ANANEL H.-P. | Cleopatra, at the solicitation of Alexandra, appeals to Antony against Herod. | L. MUNATIUS PLAN-
CUS, <i>Legatus</i> . | Sex. Pompey put to death at Miletus by Antony's general Titius. | 719 |
| 34 | Herod.....4
Goes to Antony, and appeases him by presents.
Puts his uncle Joseph to death. | Antony summons Herod before him at Laodicea.
Gives Cleopatra Cœle-Syria.
Antony in Armenia.
Returns to Egypt. | | Octavian in Gaul. Astrologers and sorcerers expelled from Rome.
Sosius triumphs for the capture of Jerusalem. | 720 |
| 33 | Herod.....5
Quarrel with Malchus, King of Arabia. | Antony forbids Octavia from joining him.
Antony in Media. | | Agrippa ædile.
Final rupture between Octavian and Antony. | 721 |
| 32 | Herod.....6
Levies troops on the side of Antony, who sends him against Malchus. Herod, at first victorious, defeated in Cœle-Syria. | Antony and Cleopatra join the fleet at Ephesus.
Proceed to Athens, and thence to Corcyra, and winter at Patræ. | | Sosius and Domitius, the consuls, join Antony. Titius and Plancus go over to Octavian. | 722 |
| 31 | Herod.....7
Dreadful earthquake in Judæa.
Herod sues to Malchus for peace, which is refused. Defeats the Arabians. Puts Hyrcanus to death. | Flight of Cleopatra and Antony from Actium to Egypt.
Herod advises Antony to put Cleopatra to death, and then deserts his cause. | L. CALPURNIUS PISONIUS, <i>Legatus</i> . | BATTLE OF ACTIUM (Sep. 2).
Octavian proceeds to Asia.
Winters at Samos. | 723 |
| S 30 | Herod.....8
Meets Octavian at Rhodes, and is confirmed in his kingdom (about April). Escorts Octavian to Antioch, and returns to Judæa. | Three embassies from Antony and Cleopatra to Octavian.
<i>Egypt reduced to a Roman province.</i>
[NOTE. Egypt still retains importance in Scripture History as a chief seat of the Jewish Dispersion.] | Q. DIDIUS, <i>Legatus</i> . | After a hasty visit to Italy, Octavian advances to Egypt. Death of Antony and Cleopatra. | 724 |

TABLE IV.—KINGDOM OF HEROD THE GREAT—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT, ARABIA, ETC. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|--|--|--|--|--------|
| 29 | Herod.....9
Puts Mariamne to death, about the close of the year. | | M. VALERIUS MES-
SALA, <i>Legatus</i> . | Three triumphs of Octavian.
Temple of Janus shut. | 725 |
| 28 | Herod.....10
Alexandra, daughter of Ilyrcanus, put to death. | | (?) M. TULLIUS CIO-
ERO (son of the or-
ator), <i>Legatus</i> . | Illness of Octavian.
Census taken. No. of citizens 4,164,000 | 726 |
| 27 | Herod.....11 | Egypt is among the imperial provinces. | Syria an imperial province, governed by a <i>Prefect</i> , as <i>Legatus Cæsaris</i> | The name of AUGUSTUS conferred on Octavian, with supreme power for ten years.
He divides the provinces with the Senate. | 727 |
| 26 | Herod.....12
Salome divorces Costabarus, and betrays the last of the family of Hyrcanus, who are put to death.
Herod builds a theatre at Jerusalem and amphitheatre at Jericho, and founds games in honor of Augustus. | Disgrace and suicide of the prefect Cornelius Gallus. | | Augustus in Gaul and Spain. | 728 |
| 25 | Herod.....13
Indignation at Herod's Romanizing.
Conspiracy of the Ten.
Herod strengthens the Antonia and fortifies Samaria.
Famine and Plague. | | | He falls sick at Tarraco.
During his absence, Julia is married to Marcellus.
Temple of Janus again shut. | 729 |
| 24 | Herod.....14
Lends 500 auxiliaries to Ælius Gallus.
Another famine in Judæa and Syria; relieved by Herod with corn from Egypt.
His sons Alexander and Aristobulus sent to Rome.
Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Batanea, added to his kingdom. | Expedition of the prefect ÆLIUS GALLUS into Arabia.
The Ethiopians, under Candace, invade Egypt: defeated by Petronius. | VARRO, <i>Legatus</i> . | Augustus returns to Rome, still ill. | 730 |
| S 23 | Herod.....15
Employs 50,000 men to gather the abundant harvest.
[NOTE. — It seems that the practice now was to reap, though not to sow, on the Sabbatic year.]
Visits Agrippa in the winter. | Ælius Gallus enters the country of Aretas, the relative of OBODAS, King of Petra; and returns to Egypt. | M. VIPSANIUS AGRIPPA, special <i>Legatus</i> , administers the province from Lesbos.
Receives a visit from Herod at Mytilene. | Augustus again ill. Receives the Tribunitian power for life.
Jealousy between Marcellus and Agrippa.
Death of Marcellus. | 731 |

TABLE IV.—KINGDOM OF HEROD THE GREAT—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT, ARABIA, ETC. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|---|---|---|--------|
| 22 | Herod.....16
Rebuilds his palace,
Removes JESUS,
the son of Phabi,
H.-P., the successor
of Ananel, and
appoints SIMON H.-
P., whose daughter
Mariamne he mar-
ries. Builds the
fortress of Herodi-
um 7½ m. from Je-
rusalem. | The Æthiopians
repulsed by Pe-
tronius. | | Plague and famine
in Italy.
Conspiracy of Mu-
ræna.
Augustus visits
Sicily. | 732 |
| 21 | Herod.....17
Founds <i>Cæsarea</i> ,
probably in this
year. | The Æthiopians
send an embassy
to Augustus at
Samos. | Agrippa summoned
from Asia to marry
Julia. | Agrippa forbids
Egyptian rites at
Rome.
Augustus in Greece.
Winters at Samos. | 733 |
| 20 | Herod.....18
Defends himself be-
fore Augustus, at
Antioch, against a
complaint of the
Gadarenes. Au-
gustus gives Pa-
neæ to Herod,
and the Tetrarchy
of Perseæ to his
brother Pheroras.
Appoints Herod
<i>perpetual joint</i>
<i>Procurator of Syr-</i>
<i>ia</i> . Herod erects
a temple to Au-
gustus at Paneæ.
Remits one-third of
the taxes. Pro-
poses the scheme
of rebuilding the
Temple. | | Augustus visits
Syria: deprives
the Tyrians and
Sidonians of their
freedom: settles
the petty king-
doms.
Tiberius sent to
Armenia to place
Tigranes on the
throne. | Augustus in Asia
Minor and Syria.
The standards of
Cræsus restored
by King Phraates.
Escorted by Herod
to the Syrian coast
(probably at Se-
leucia). Augustus
winters at Samos.
Birth of CAIUS, the
son of Agrippa and
Julia. | 734 |
| 19 | Herod.....19
Preparations for
rebuilding the
Temple. | | M. T. CICERO, <i>Lega-</i>
<i>tus</i> (son of the ora-
tor), placed here by
some writers. | Agrippa goes to
Gaul and Spain.
Augustus returns to
Rome. | 735 |
| 18 | Herod.....20
<i>Rebuilding of the</i>
<i>Temple</i> (the <i>vâc</i>
or Holy Place) be-
gun about Pass-
over. Herod sails
to Rome and brings
back his sons Aris-
tobulus and Alex-
ander; and banish-
es Antipater, his
son by Doriæ. | | | Supreme power re-
newed to Augustus
for five years; and
Tribunitian power
to Agrippa for five
years. | 736 |
| 17 | Herod.....21
Marries Alexander
to Glaphyra,
daughter of Ar-
chelaus, King of
Cappadocia, and
Aristobulus to Ber-
enice.
The Holy Place
finished. | | | <i>Ludi Sæculares</i> , 5th
time.
Birth of Lucius Cæ-
sar, son of Agrippa,
whom Augustus
adopts, with his
brother Caius. | 737 |

TABLE IV.—KINGDOM OF HEROD THE GREAT—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT, ARABIA, ETC. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|--|--|---|--------|
| S 16 | Herod.....22
Goes to meet Agrippa, and invites him to Judæa. | | AGRIPPA, again <i>Legatus</i> , sent to regulate affairs of Syria, arrives in Asia. | Augustus goes to Gaul. Settles disturbances on all the European frontiers. | 738 |
| 15 | Herod.....23
Receives the visit of Agrippa. | | Visits Judæa: sees Cæsarea, Alexandrium, Herodium, Hyrcania. Sacrifices in the Temple at Jerusalem, and returns to Ephesus. | The Rhodians conquered by Tiberius and Drusus. | 739 |
| 14 | Herod.....24
Sails to visit Agrippa. Follows him to the Euxine, and meets him at Sinope (see col. 3). Privileges of the Jews confirmed by Agrippa. Herod addresses the Jews, and remits one-fourth of the taxes. Intrigues of Salome and Pheroras against Aristobulus and Alexander. Antipater recalled. | | Agrippa's expedition against Bosporus. Herod pleads with him for the Iliares. (NICOLAUS DAMASCOENUS employed in this affair.) Returns with Herod to Samos. | Augustus in Gaul. | 740 |
| 13 | Herod.....25
Advancement of Antipater. Herod takes him to visit Agrippa, who takes Antipater to Rome, whence he writes letters against Aristobulus and Alexander. | | End of Agrippa's 10 years' administration of Asia and Syria. No special prefect during this interval. | Augustus returns to Rome from Gaul, and Agrippa from the East. Tribunitian power to Agrippa for five years more. He goes to Pannonia. | 741 |
| 12 | Herod.....26
Refuses the hand of Salome to the Arabian Syllæus. Further intrigues against the sons of Mariamne. | | The government now falls to M. TITUS, <i>Legatus</i> . Asia (the province) suffers from earthquakes. | Death of Lepidus. Augustus Pont. MAX.
Death of Agrippa.
Birth of Agrippa Postumus.
Victories of Tiberius in Pannonia, and of Drusus in Germany. | 742 |
| 11 | Herod.....27
Herod sails to Rome with Aristobulus and Alexander, whom he accuses before Augustus at Aquileia. Augustus effects a reconciliation. Herod returns by way of Cilicia. Invests Antipater, Aristobulus and Alexander with insignia of royalty. Birth of Agrippa, son of Aristobulus. | During Herod's absence the Trachonites rebel, at the instigation of Syllæus. | | Drusus in Germany. Augustus at Milan, Ravenna, and Aquileia; while Tiberius subdues the revolt of Dalmatia and Pannonia. Herod contributes 300 talents for the games (Augustalia?), and receives the copper mines of Cyprus. Marriage of Julia to Tiberius. Death of Octavia. | 743 |

TABLE IV.—KINGDOM OF HEROD THE GREAT—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT, ARABIA, ETC. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.D. |
|------|--|--|---|---|------|
| 11 | The Outer Temple (ἱερόν) finished. | | | | |
| 10 | Herod.....28
Building of Cæsarea finished.
Herod opens David's tomb in search of treasure.
New family dissensions appeased for the time. | Massacre of the Trachonites by Herod. | Parthian hostages delivered to the prefect Titius. | Augustus in Gaul. Tiberius subdues the Dalmatians and Dacæ, and Drusus subdues the Chatti. They return to Rome with Augustus.
Aug. 1. CLAUDIUS born. | 744 |
| S 9 | Herod.....29
New family dissensions, appeased by Archelaus, King of Cappadocia. | Continued disturbances in Trachonitis. | C. SENTIUS SATURNINUS, <i>Legatus</i> (probably in this or the next year). | Death of Drusna. Tiberius again subdues the Dalmatians and Pannonians. | 745 |
| 8 | Herod.....30
Sails with Archelaus to Italy, to state his case against Syllæus.
Visits Olympia on the way, and makes presents for the games (Midsummer, Ol. 193-1). | Syllæus engages to give up the Trachonite brigands, but sails for Rome without performing the engagement.
Remains there, and accuses Herod to Augustus. | Herod complains to Saturninus of the Trachonites and Syllæus. | Augustus receives the supreme power for 10 years more.

Proceeds to Gaul with Tiberius, who crosses the Rhine. Both return to Rome.
Death of Mæcenas.
Census of Roman citizens. | 746 |
| 7 | Herod.....31
In disgrace with Augustus about the Arabian war: henceforth to rank as a subject.
He sends Nicolaus Damascenus to Rome; also another embassy to complain of Alexander and Aristobulus.
Herod allowed to proceed against them in conjunction with a council. | Herod razes the Trachonite stronghold, and makes war on the Arabians.
ARFTAS succeeds Obodas as king of Arabia Petraea.
Syllæus condemned to death by Augustus; but first sent to Arabia to make reparation.
He plots against Herod.
Augustus confirms Aretas, instead of giving Petra to Herod. | <i>Census of Palestine</i> , under Saturninus, perhaps connected with the threat of Augustus to treat Herod as a subject.

The census was ordered in this year and carried out in the next. | Tiberius goes to Germany.
Augustus at Rome. Preparations for absorbing Judæa into the Empire. | 747 |
| 6 | Herod.....32
The Council meets at Berytus and condemns Alexander and Aristobulus, who are strangled at Sebaste (Samarra).
Agitation in Judæa. Antipater tries to gain partisans by gifts, and then by terror.
Forms a plot with Pheroras, Doris, &c., against Herod.
He procures a letter summoning him to Rome. | Complicated intrigues of Syllæus, Fabatus (Cæsar's procurator), and Herod.
Herod settles Zamaris, a Babylonian Jew, in <i>Balanea</i> .

[<i>Mr. Lewin's Dates.</i> Feb. 22 (about), Birth of John the Baptist. Aug. 1 (about), NATIVITY OF JESUS CHRIST. See c. xii. p. 858.] | Saturninus and the procurator Volturnius take part in the trial of the sons of Mariamne (an indication of Herod's subjection).
Saturninus receives presents from Antipater.
P. QUINTILIUS VARRUS (<i>Legatus</i>) succeeds Saturninus before Sept. 2. | Tiberius in Armenia.
Retires to Rhodes, and remains there seven years. | 748 |

TABLE IV.—KINGDOM OF HEROD THE GREAT—continued.

| B.C. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT, ARABIA, ETC. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|---------------|---|---|--|---|--------|
| 6 | The census commences about July. The Pharisees refuse the oath to Cæsar and Herod, and are fined. They spread the report that Messiah has come; and Herod puts their leaders to death. | | | | 748 |
| 5
Apr. | Herod.....33
Sends Antipater to Rome with his will, appointing him his heir, and recalls thence his sons Archelaus and Philip.
Pheroras retires to Petraea. His death discovers Antipater's plot.
Disgrace of Doris.
Simon deposed, and MATTHIAS made II.-P. (before the Fast, Sept. 11). | Syllæus goes to Rome. | Varsus is present at Jerusalem at trial of Antipater, and returns next day to Antioch. | C. Cæsar receives the <i>Toga Virilis</i> . | 749 |
| Aug. | Bathyllus sent by Antipater to poison Herod. | | | | |
| Nov. | Antipater lands at Caesarea, goes to Jerusalem, and is condemned by a Council. Herod writes to Augustus. Falls ill, and alters his will, making Herod Antipas his successor. | | | | |
| 4 | Herod.....34
Goes to Jericho. Pulling down of the eagle, the symbol of Roman power. Matthias deposed, and Joazar made II.-P.
Herod harangues the chiefs of the nation at Jericho, and burns the Rabbis. | 5 end, or 4 beg ⁵ .
NOTE. On this view of the Nativity, the events at Bethlehem; the arrival of the Magi at Jerusalem, their adoration at Bethlehem, and return home; the purification of Mary, and presentation of Jesus in the Temple; the flight of Joseph and Mary with Jesus to Egypt; and the massacre of the children at Bethlehem, must all be comprehended in the first three months of this year. | NATIVITY OF JESUS CHRIST, according to Sulpicius and most modern authorities.
The Census, still in progress (if begun in B.C. 6), was probably one cause of the disturbance at Jerusalem. | | 751 |
| Mar.
12-13 | <i>Eclipse of the Moon.</i> | | | | |
| 15-19 | Goes to the springs of Callirhoë, but without effect; and is plunged in a bath of oil. Despairs of his life. | | | | |
| 19 | Returns to Jericho: donation to the army. Jewish chiefs shut up in the Hippodrome. | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |

TABLE IV.—KINGDOM OF HEROD THE GREAT—continued.

| B.O. | JUDÆA. | EGYPT, ARABIA, ETC. | SYRIA. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|---------------------|---|---|--------|-------|--------|
| 4
Mar.
27 | Herod orders their death immediately on his own.
Answer from Rome about Antipater.
Herod attempts suicide.
Last attempt of Antipater; Herod orders his death.
Makes a new will. | | | | 750 |
| Apr.
1 | HEROD DIES AT JERICHO, five days after the execution of Antipater, in his 70th year. | | | | |
| 2 | The prisoners in the Hippodrome set free.
ARCHELAUS is greeted as King.
Funeral of Herod. | | | | |
| 9 | Archelaus sacrifices in the Temple. | | | | |
| 10
Pass-
ver. | Riot and massacre in the Temple.
Archelaus goes to Cæsarea, has an interview with Varus, and sails for Rome, whither HEROD ANTIPAS follows. | Joseph and Mary return from Egypt, with Jesus, and turn aside to Nazareth in Galilee. | | | |

TABLE V THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART I. THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

The leading events only of our Saviour's life are inserted here, the full details having been given in the Table of the Harmony of the Gospels.

| B.C. | JUDAEA. | GALILEE | OTHER PARTS. | EGYPT AND ARABIA. | SYRIA AND THE EAST. | ROME. | A.D.C. |
|---------------------------|--|---------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--|--------|
| 4 | Date of the NATIVITY, as now generally received.
Death of Herod. (See Table IV)
Archelaus, Herod Antipater's son at Nazareth.
Philip Insurrection of Judaea,
put down by Varus.
Go to Rome.
Varus visits Jerusalem,
and leaves there a Roman legion
The Procurator Saturninus
beheaded in the Paganorum
Order restored by Varus. | | Insurrections in Parva
and Idumea, put down
by Varus. | Arctas sends aid to Varus.
Varus. | Varus advances to re-
lieve Sepphoris.

P. SCLAVIUS QUINTUS
(Cyprianus) probably
succeeds Varus. (See
N. T. Hist., p. 185 and
Lewin, No. 965.) | Claudius present at
the first audience of
Archelaus, about mid-
summer.
Embassy of 50 Jews
arrives to ask for the
annexation of Judaea
to Syria.
Augustus gives his de-
cision, about August. | 750 |
| May 31
Pente-
cost. | ARCHELAUS 1 Herod Philip.
Gaius (not king) Tetrarch of Parana and Trachonitis, Ituraea,
of Idumea, Samaria, Galilee.
Joazar deposed, and
EXASAR made H.P.
Archelaus 2 Philip.
Subduces the revolt of Bulda Julius (Bethsal-Bulda On area-Philippi)
Athronges.
The Nativity, according to Cassiodorus and Clemens Alexandrinus. | | | | | GALBA born (died.), but
rather in A.D. 5. | 751 |
| 8 | Archelaus 3 Antipas.
Archelaus 4 Antipas.
The Nativity, according to Eusebius, etc. | | | | | LUCIUS CAESAR assumes
the toga Virilis.
Julia banished.
Augustus saluted as
Peter Patria. | 752 |
| 1 | The Nativity, according to Tertullian. | | | | | | 753 |

TABLE V. THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART I. THE GOSPEL HISTORY—continued.

| A.D. | PALESTINE AND THE CONNEVED LANDS. | | | | | ROME | A.D.C. |
|------|--|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|--|--------|
| | JUDÆA. | GALILEE. | OTHER PARTS. | EGYPT AND ARABIA. | SYRIA AND THE EAST. | | |
| 1 | Archelaus5 | Antipas6 | Philip7 | | Censorinus, oh.
No new prefect while
Calus Caesar was in the
East. | Peace with Partia, be-
tween Calus Caesar and
Pharæa. | 754 |
| 2 | The Nativity, Dionysius Exiguus
Archelaus6 | Antipas.6 | Philip.6 | | | Tiberius returns to
Rome.
War in Germany.
Calus Caesar victorious
in Armenia
Lucius Cæsar dies at
Marselles, Aug. 10 | 755 |
| 3 | Archelaus7 | Antipas.7 | Philip7 | | Calus Caesar wounded
and recalled. | Supremacy of Augustus
is for 10 years more. | 756 |
| 4 | Archelaus8 | Antipas8 | Philip.8 | | Dies in Lycia.
L. Volturnus Saturni-
nus, Legatus. | Tiberius adopted by
Augustus, June 31 | 757 |
| 5 | Archelaus9 | Antipas.9 | Philip.9 | | | He goes to Germany.
Census of Italy. | 758 |
| 6 | Archelaus10 | Antipas.10 | Philip.10 | | Quintus Lepidus (2d
time.) | Famine, earthquakes,
and inundation of Ty-
ber. | 759 |
| 7 | Banished by Augustus
Birth of St. Paul
(Coryb. and Howson).
Archelaus10 | Antipas.10 | Philip.10 | | Quintus Lepidus (2d
time.) | Tiberius in Germany.
Famine at Rome. | 760 |
| 8 | Archelaus11 | Antipas.11 | Philip.11 | | Makes a census of Judæa | Tiberius and Germani-
cus in Pannonia.
Agrippa Postumus ban-
ished to Planesia.
Birth of Seneca. | 761 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|---------------|----|--------------|----|-------|-------------|--|
| 8 | ANANUS made H.-P.
Coptinus | 2 | Antipas..... | 12 | Phillip..... | 12 | | 761 | The Pannonians and Dalmatians sue for Peace. |
| Apr.9 Pass-over. | Jesus (age 12) at Jerusalem, according to Lewin's date. | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Coptinus.....
M. AMSVIVUS (Proc.) 1
Birth of Paul (Lewin).
Jesus (age 12) at Jerusalem, according to the received date. | 3 | Antipas..... | 13 | Phillip..... | 13 | | 762 | Tiberius returns to Rome, and is sent to Dalmatia.
Varus and his legions destroyed in Germany. |
| Mar. 29 Pass-over. | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | Ambivius.....
Salome (sister of Herod the Great) dies. | 2 | Antipas..... | 14 | Phillip..... | 14 | | 763 | Birth of VESPASIAN.
Tiberius in Germany. |
| 11 | Ambivius..... | 3 | Antipas..... | 15 | Phillip..... | 15 | | 764 | Successful campaign of Tiberius and Germanicus in Germany. |
| 12 | Ambivius.....
4. ANNIUS RUFUS (Procurator).....
The received chronology dates from this year to the ministry of John in the 15th of Tiberius. A.D. 26.
This is the date used in the Tables. | 4 | Antipas..... | 16 | Phillip..... | 16 | | 765 | War in Germany finished.
Tiberius triumphs, and is associated with Augustus in the command of the army and provinces (not yet of Rome and Italy). |
| S 13 | Annius Rufus..... | 2 | Antipas..... | 17 | Phillip..... | 17 | | Aug. 31 766 | Birth of CALIGULA.
Empire renewed to Augustus for 10 years. |
| 14 | Annius Rufus.....
[Mr. Lewin dates from this year to the ministry of John in the 16th year of Tiberius, A.D. 28.] | 3 | Antipas | 18 | Phillip..... | 18 | | 767 Aug. 19 | Third census of the Empire under Augustus.
<i>Augustus dies at Nola.</i>
TIBERIUS, IMP.....1
Murder of Agrippa Postumus. |
| 15 | 5. VALERIUS GRATUS (Procurator).....
Removes Ananus, and makes ISHMAEL H.-P., and soon after makes ELEAZAR H.-P. | | Antipas..... | 19 | Phillip..... | 19 | | 768 | Tiberius..... 2
Germanicus in Germany.
Birth of VITELLIUS. |

TABLE V. THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART I. THE GOSPEL HISTORY—continued.

| A.D. | PALESTINE AND THE CONNECTED LANDS | | | | EGYPT AND ARABIA | SYRIA AND THE EAST. | ROME. | A.B.C. |
|------|---|------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--|---------------|
| | JUDEA. | GALILEE. | OTHER PARTS. | | | | | |
| 16 | Valerius Gratus 3 Antipas
Removes Eleazar, and
makes Simon H.-P. | 20 Antipas | 20 Philip | | | Disturbances in Parthia,
Armenia, and Media.
Revolt of the Jews Asi-
neus and Anileus from
the Parthians at Baby-
lon, composed by the
king Artabanus. | Tiberius 3
Astrologers and Sor-
cerers expelled from
Italy.
Third Campaign of Ger-
manicus in Germany. | 700 |
| 17 | Valerius Gratus 5 Antipas
Removes Hinson, and
makes JOSEPH CAIA-
RUS H.-P. | 21 Antipas | 21 Philip | | | GN. CALPURNIUS PISO,
Legatus.
XII. Cities of Asia de-
stroyed by an earth-
quake.
Germanicus goes to Ar-
menia, and Piso to
Syria.
Death of Germanicus
near Antioch.
C. SERVILIUS SATURNINUS
Proletarius. | Tiberius 4
Triumph of Germani-
cus.
He is sent to the East. | 770
May 20 |
| 18 | Valerius Gratus 4 Antipas | 23 Antipas | 23 Philip | | | Germanicus goes to Ar-
menia, and Piso to
Syria. | Tiberius 6
Laws of treason en-
forced at Rome. | 771 |
| 19 | Valerius Gratus 5 Antipas
[Saul's family perhaps
quit Tarsus owing to
the commotions in Si-
ria after the death of
Germanicus.—Lewin.] | 23 Antipas | 23 Philip | Germanicus visits
EGYPT. | | Death of Germanicus
near Antioch.
C. SERVILIUS SATURNINUS
Proletarius. | Tiberius 6
Drusus in Germany.
Jewish and Egyptian
rites prohibited at
Rome. | 773 |
| 20 | Valerius Gratus 6 Antipas | 24 Antipas | 24 Philip | | | | Tiberius 7
Agrippina brings the
ashes of Germanicus
to Rome.
Suicide of Piso.
Tiberius 8
Withdraws to Campa-
nia. | 773 |
| 21 | Valerius Gratus 7 Antipas | 25 Antipas | 25 Philip | | | Death of Quirinus. | | 774 |
| 22 | Valerius Gratus 8 Antipas | 26 Antipas | 26 Philip | | | L. POMPONIUS FLACUS,
Propretor. | Tiberius 9
Returns to Rome.
Peace in the provinces.
Rapid rise of Blaudius. | 776 |

| | | | | | |
|---------|---|---------------------|----|--|-----|
| 23 | Valerius Gratus . . . 9 Antipas | 27 Philip | 10 | Tiberius | 776 |
| 24 | Valerius Gratus . . . 10 Antipas | 28 Philip | 11 | Retires to Campania. | |
| 25 | Valerius Gratus . . . 11 Antipas | 29 Philip | 12 | Death of Drusus. | 777 |
| 26 | Valerius Gratus . . . 12 Antipas | 30 Philip | 13 | Tiberius | 778 |
| | POSTUM PILATUS (Procurator) | | 14 | Tiberius | 779 |
| | Bartholomew of Jews (Mr Lewis places it two years later). | | 15 | (From his association with Augustus) . . . | |
| 27 | Pontius Pilatus . . . 2 Antipas | 31 Philip | 16 | His final retirement to Campania. | |
| | <i>Epiphanius and Tertullian on Jewish custom</i> | | 17 | Tiberius | 780 |
| Apr 9 | First Miracle at Cana | | 18 | Shuts himself up in Caprea. | |
| | Second Miracle at Cana | | 19 | Tiberius | 781 |
| 28 | Pontius Pilatus . . . 3 Antipas | 32 Philip | 20 | Death of Julia. | |
| Mar. 20 | <i>Beginning of the Gospel from Galilee.</i> | | 21 | Marriage of Agrippina to Domitianus Ahenobarbus (the parents of Nero). | |
| | Rejects on at Nazareth. | | 22 | Tiberius | 782 |
| | First Galilean Circuit | | 23 | Death of Livy. | |
| | Christ's Second Passover, probably at Jerusalem | | 24 | Tiberius | 783 |
| | Ministry in Galilee resumed. | | 25 | Death of Livy. | |
| | The Apostles chosen. | | 26 | Tiberius | 784 |
| | Sermon on the Mount. | | 27 | Death of Livy. | |
| | Second Galilean Circuit. | | 28 | Tiberius | 785 |
| 29 | Pontius Pilatus . . . 4 Antipas | 33 Philip | 29 | Tiberius | 786 |
| Apr. 16 | Third Galilean Circuit | | 30 | Death of Livy. | |
| | Christ's Third Passover, at the time of the flooding the 5000 on the lake of Galilee | | 31 | Tiberius | 787 |
| | Christ's retirement into the country of Herod Philip, and final departure from Galilee. | | 32 | Tiberius | 788 |

TABLE V. THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART I. THE GOSPEL HISTORY—continued.

| A.D. | PALESTINE AND THE CONNECTED LANDS. | | | EGYPT AND ARABIA. | SYRIA AND THE EAST. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|---------------|--|---------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| | JUDÆA. | GALILEE. | OTHER PARTS. | | | | |
| 29
Oct. 11 | <i>Feast of Tabernacles.</i>
Jesus at Jerusalem.
(Respecting the interval to the ensuing Passover, see N. T. Hist. ch. X.) | | | | | | |
| Dec. | <i>Feast of Dedication.</i>
Jesus visits Jerusalem. | | | | | | |
| 30
Mar. | Pontius Pilatus.....5 | Antipas | 84 Philip.....34 | | | Tiberius17
Velleius Paterculus
writes his <i>History</i> . | 793 |
| 30
Apr. 1 | F. Jesus arrives at Bethany. | | | | | | |
| 5
Th. | S. Enters Jerusalem. <i>The Passover.</i> | | | | | | |
| 6
G. F. | THE CRUCIFIXION. | | | | | | |
| 8
E. S. | THE RESURRECTION. | | | | | | |
| 17
Th. | THE ASCENSION. | | | | | | |
| May
27 | S. Pentecost (2d day).
Whitsunday. | | | | | | |

NOTE.—Mr. Lewis's dates for the Ministry and Passion of our Lord are given at p. 358.

TABLE VI. THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART II. THE APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

| A.D. | CHRISTIANITY. | PALESTINE AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD. | | | | SYRIA, EGYPT, AND THE EAST. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|---|---|---|--|---|-------|--------|
| | | JUDÆA. | GALILEE. | OTHER PARTS. | | | | |
| 30 | May 17. The Ascension. 120 disciples at Jerusalem.
Election of Matthias.
<i>Pentecost</i> (Whitsunday).
Descent of the Spirit.
Spread of the Gospel at Jerusalem.
Death of Ananias and Sapphira. | Pilate.....5 | Antipas.....34 | Philip.....34 | FLACCUS, <i>proætor</i> .
HEROD AGRIPPA, son of Aristobulus, banished from Rome, comes to Idumæa. | Tiberius.....17 | 783 | |
| 31 | | Pilate.....6 | Antipas.....35 | Philip.....35 | | Tiberius.....16
Fall of Sejanus. | 784 | |
| 32 | | Pilate.....7 | Antipas.....36
Protects Herod Agrippa | Philip.....36 | In Egypt, Severus succeeded by Flaccus (<i>Procurator</i>). | Tiberius.....19
Sails from Capree to the Tiber.
Birth of OTTO. | 785 | |
| 33 | The Church still confined to Jerusalem.
[The year of the Crucifixion, according to Mr. L. in.] | Pilate.....8 | Antipas.....37 | Philip.....37
Dies, after Aug. 19.
His tetrarchy attached to Syria. | Agrippa expelled from Syria.
Death of Flaccus. | Tiberius.....20
Returns to Capree with Calus Caesar (Caligula).
Deaths of Agrippina and Drusus. | 786 | |
| S 34 | Complaints of the Hel-lenists, and appointment of D acens. | Pilate.....9 | Antipas.....38 | Jewish insurrection in Babylonia, continued. | L. VITELLIUS, <i>Legatus</i> of Syria. | Tiberius.....21
Visits Latium, but stops short of Rome. | 787 | |
| 35 | Preaching of Stephen. | Pilate.....10 | Antipas.....39 | | | Tiberius.....22 | 788 | |
| 36 | Martyrdom of Stephen in this or the following year. | Pilate.....11
Massacre of the Samaritans.
Pilate deposed. | Antipas.....40 | | Expedition of Vitellius to Parthia.
He deposes Pilate, and sends him to Rome. | Tiberius.....23
Herod Agrippa sails to Rome: with Calus at Capree. | 789 | |
| 37 | Paul a <i>vesvior</i> (28).
March 19. <i>Passover</i> .
Vitellius deposes Caligula, and makes JONATHAN H.-P. | Pilate deposed.
.....41 | Antipas.....41
War with Aretas, king of Petra. | Calus gives the tetrarchy of Philip to Herod Agrippa I....1 | Vitellius at Jerusalem.
Aretas takes Damascus. | Tiberius dies, Mar. 16
CALIGULA.....1
Releases Agrippa. | 790 | |

* The years of Paul's life are inserted from Mr. Lewin, not as professing to be exact, but to give some general idea of his age at each stage of his course

TABLE VI. THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART II. THE APOSTOLIC HISTORY—continued.

| A.D. | CHRISTIANITY. | PALESTINE AND THE NEIGH. ORTHOOD. | | | SYRIA, EGYPT, AND THE EAST. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|-------------|---|--|----------|---|---|---|--------|
| | | JUDÆA. | GALILEE. | OTHER PARTS. | | | |
| 37
May 9 | <i>Antipas</i> .
Vitellius again at Jerusalem with Herod Antipas, and departs.
<i>Great Persecution</i> .
CONVERSION OF ST. PAUL (32). | | | | | Put to death Tiberius, the son of Drusus. Illness of Caligula. Birth of I. Domitius Ahenobarbus (the emperor Nero). | 790 |
| 38 | St. Paul (33) at Damascus and in Arabia. Philip converts the Samaritans and the Ethiopian eunuch. | MARCELLUS, <i>Procurator</i> Antipas.....42 | | Agrippa I.....2
Sails to Judæa. | Plots and massacres of the Jews at Alexandria. Philo, etc., sent on an embassy to Rome. | Death of Drusilla, his favorite sister. | 791 |
| 39 | Paul (31) at Jerusalem with Peter. Plot of the Jews against his life. Departs for Tarsus.
<i>Rest of the Churches</i> .
Conversion of Cornelius.
Paul (32) in Syria and Cilicia. | Caligula's attempt to Antipas.....43
set up his statue in the Temple.

Great commotions of Antipas banished the people. | | Agrippa I.....3
Made king.
Receives the dominions of Herod, Galilee and Perea.

Agrippa I.....4
Agrippa at Rome. (<i>His years, continued in col. 2</i>) | P. PERMONIUS, <i>Legatus</i> . Delays the affair of the statue. Caligula persists.
Fresh Jewish insurrection in Babylon. | Caligula.....3
Alexandrian embassy at Rome.
Caligula goes to Gaul. | 792 |
| 40 | | | | | | Caligula.....4
Returns to Rome, Aug. 31.
His works at Balaë, etc.
Second hearing of the Jewish embassy.
Birth of TITUS. | 793 |
| 41 | The Gospel preached to the <i>Gentiles</i> at Antioch.
Paul (33) still in Syria and Cilicia. | HEROD AGRIPPA.....1 (B)
Receives the kingdom of JUDÆA and SAMARIA, with the tetrarchy of <i>Abilena</i> .
Helena, queen of Adiabene, at Jerusalem.
Contributes afterward to relieve the famine. | | HEROD.....1
(Brother of Agrippa) made king of <i>Chaldea</i> . | Contest renewed at Alexandria. Masacre of Jews at Seleucia. | Caligula ased. Jan. 4.
CLAUDIUS.....1
Feb. 13. Birth of Britannicus.
Edict of toleration for the Jews.
Seneca banished. | 794 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------|------------------------------|---------|--|---|-----|
| 43 | Barnabas sent to Antioch. | 2 (6) | Herod (of Chalcis) | 3 | Petrus enters the edict of toleration. He is superceded. | Famine in Italy. Aulus Plautius sent to Britain. | 704 |
| 44 | Barnabas fetches Paul from Tarsus, they labor a year at Antioch. | 3 (7) | Herod Agrippa. | 3 (7) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Vitus Masius, Lega- tus. Quarrels with Agrippa. | 706 |
| 45 | Agabus prophesies a great famine. | 4 (8) | Herod Agrippa. | 4 (8) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Claudius goes to Britain. | 708 |
| 46 | Agabus' prediction fulfilled. | 5 (9) | Herod Agrippa. | 5 (9) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Claudius (by some placed as late as 46) the empire with games. | 710 |
| 47 | Paul and Barnabas at Jerusalem (or in Antioch) | 6 (10) | Herod Agrippa. | 6 (10) | Herod (of Chalcis) | The Rhodians deprived of their liberty. | 712 |
| 48 | Paul and Barnabas visit Paphia, Paphos, and Lyconia, and return to Antioch (Lewin). | 7 (11) | Herod Agrippa. | 7 (11) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Excuse of the son, on his birthday, a point whence to calculate all subsequent dates. | 714 |
| 49 | Christianity makes way at Rome. | 8 (12) | Herod Agrippa. | 8 (12) | Herod (of Chalcis) | The young Agrippa (afterward Agrippa II.) in favor with Claudius at Rome. | 716 |
| 50 | Paul (30) and Barnabas at Antioch (Lewin). | 9 (13) | Herod Agrippa. | 9 (13) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Claudius | 718 |
| 51 | The Jews at Antioch. | 10 (14) | Herod Agrippa. | 10 (14) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Outrage of Messalina. | 720 |
| 52 | Paul (40) and Barnabas go to Jerusalem; (Munell) there. | 11 (15) | Herod Agrippa. | 11 (15) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Claudius | 722 |
| 53 | Paul and Barnabas placed in A.D. 50 by Gnybear, etc.) | 12 (16) | Herod Agrippa. | 12 (16) | Herod (of Chalcis) | Death of Messalina. Famine in Syria. | 724 |

| A.D. | PALESTINE AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD. | | OTHER PARTS. | SYRIA, EGYPT, AND THE EAST. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------------|---|---|---|---|---|--------|
| | CHRISTIANITY. | PROVINCE OF JUDEA. | | | | |
| 49 | Second circuit of Paul (41), with Silas. (Lewin: begun in A.D. 51, according to Conybeare, etc.) Syria, Cilicia, Derbe, and Lystra. Timothy associated with Paul. | | AGRIPPA II., son of Herod Agrippa I., made king of Chalcis.1 | | Claudius.9
Marries Agrippina.
Recall of Seneca. | 802 |
| Ap. 5. | Passover. Disturbances at Jerusalem; and collision with the Roman troops.
[Council at Jerusalem? comp. A.D. 48.] | | AGRIPPA II.2
King of Chalcis. | UMMIUS QUADRATUS, Legatus (this or next year). | Claudius.10
Adoption of Nero.
Caracacus at Rome. | 803 |
| 51 | Paul (43) joined by Luke at Troas; crosses to Macedonia.
At Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea and Athens. | Disturbances in Samaria, extend to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles, Oct. 8.
Quadratus deposes Cumanus, and sends the H.P. Ananias as a prisoner to Rome.
ANTONIUS (CLAUDIUS) FELIX, Procurator. | AGRIPPA II.3 | | Claudius.11
Famine at Rome.
Burrus praetorian prefect. | 804 |
| 52
Feb. | Paul (44) at Corinth. Aquila and Priscilla at Corinth.
The Epistles to the Thessalonians. | | AGRIPPA II.4
At Rome.
Pleads the Jewish cause | | Claudius.12
Edict expelling the Jews from Rome.
Claudius hears the Jews and decides for the High-priest. | 805 |
| 53 | Gallio proconsul of Achaia.
Paul (45) before his trial.
Paul leaves Corinth. Sails to Ephesus. | | AGRIPPA II.5
Receives Philip's testimony in exchange for Chalcis. | Drusilla, sister of Agrippa's, marries Azizus, king of Emesa. | Claudius.13
Nero marries Octavia. | 806 |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|---|---|-----|
| 54 | At Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles (Sept. 16) — <i>Leviti</i> . or at the ensuing Pentecost (May 31). Returns to Antioch. Paul's (46) <i>1st Corinth</i> ; Galatians and <i>Philemon</i> ; Apollos at Ephesus; proceeds to Corinth. Paul at Ephesus; preaches to the Jews three months, then to the Gentiles in the school of Tyrannus. Paul (47) at Ephesus. <i>Epistles to the Galatians</i> . | Agrippa II. 6 | Berenice marries Ptolemy II., king of Cilicia, and soon deserts him. Nero (47, 17)..... 1 | 807 | |
| 55 | About May Paul at Ephesus; preaches to the Jews three months, then to the Gentiles in the school of Tyrannus. Paul (47) at Ephesus. <i>Epistles to the Galatians</i> . | Felix 4 | Agrippa II. 7 | Corbulo sent against Ptolemy II., king of Cilicia, and soon deserts him. Nero (47, 17)..... 1 | 808 |
| 56 | Paul (48) at Ephesus; Timothy and Erastus sent to Macedonia and Greece. Letter from Corinth. Paul leaves Ephesus. Titus in Macedonia, and writes <i>2d Epistle to the Corinthians</i> . Riot at the Ephesus. Paul leaves Ephesus. Titus in Macedonia, and writes <i>2d Epistle to the Corinthians</i> . Visits Illyricum. Reaches Corinth, and stays three months. Paul (50) writes <i>Epistles to the Romans</i> . | Felix 5 | Agrippa II. 8 | Nero 2 | 809 |
| 57 | Apr. 7 | Felix 6 | Agrippa II. 9 | Nero 3 | 810 |
| 58 | May | Felix 7 | Agrippa II. 10 | Nero 4 | 811 |
| 59 | Nov. | Felix 8 | Agrippa II. 11 | Nero 5 | 812 |
| 60 | Nov. | Felix 9 | Agrippa II. 12 | Nero 6 | 813 |
| 61 | Nov. | Felix 10 | Agrippa II. 13 | Nero 7 | 814 |
| 62 | Nov. | Felix 11 | Agrippa II. 14 | Nero 8 | 815 |
| 63 | Nov. | Felix 12 | Agrippa II. 15 | Nero 9 | 816 |
| 64 | Nov. | Felix 13 | Agrippa II. 16 | Nero 10 | 817 |
| 65 | Nov. | Felix 14 | Agrippa II. 17 | Nero 11 | 818 |
| 66 | Nov. | Felix 15 | Agrippa II. 18 | Nero 12 | 819 |
| 67 | Nov. | Felix 16 | Agrippa II. 19 | Nero 13 | 820 |
| 68 | Nov. | Felix 17 | Agrippa II. 20 | Nero 14 | 821 |
| 69 | Nov. | Felix 18 | Agrippa II. 21 | Nero 15 | 822 |
| 70 | Nov. | Felix 19 | Agrippa II. 22 | Nero 16 | 823 |
| 71 | Nov. | Felix 20 | Agrippa II. 23 | Nero 17 | 824 |
| 72 | Nov. | Felix 21 | Agrippa II. 24 | Nero 18 | 825 |
| 73 | Nov. | Felix 22 | Agrippa II. 25 | Nero 19 | 826 |
| 74 | Nov. | Felix 23 | Agrippa II. 26 | Nero 20 | 827 |
| 75 | Nov. | Felix 24 | Agrippa II. 27 | Nero 21 | 828 |
| 76 | Nov. | Felix 25 | Agrippa II. 28 | Nero 22 | 829 |
| 77 | Nov. | Felix 26 | Agrippa II. 29 | Nero 23 | 830 |
| 78 | Nov. | Felix 27 | Agrippa II. 30 | Nero 24 | 831 |
| 79 | Nov. | Felix 28 | Agrippa II. 31 | Nero 25 | 832 |
| 80 | Nov. | Felix 29 | Agrippa II. 32 | Nero 26 | 833 |
| 81 | Nov. | Felix 30 | Agrippa II. 33 | Nero 27 | 834 |
| 82 | Nov. | Felix 31 | Agrippa II. 34 | Nero 28 | 835 |
| 83 | Nov. | Felix 32 | Agrippa II. 35 | Nero 29 | 836 |
| 84 | Nov. | Felix 33 | Agrippa II. 36 | Nero 30 | 837 |
| 85 | Nov. | Felix 34 | Agrippa II. 37 | Nero 31 | 838 |
| 86 | Nov. | Felix 35 | Agrippa II. 38 | Nero 32 | 839 |
| 87 | Nov. | Felix 36 | Agrippa II. 39 | Nero 33 | 840 |
| 88 | Nov. | Felix 37 | Agrippa II. 40 | Nero 34 | 841 |
| 89 | Nov. | Felix 38 | Agrippa II. 41 | Nero 35 | 842 |
| 90 | Nov. | Felix 39 | Agrippa II. 42 | Nero 36 | 843 |
| 91 | Nov. | Felix 40 | Agrippa II. 43 | Nero 37 | 844 |
| 92 | Nov. | Felix 41 | Agrippa II. 44 | Nero 38 | 845 |
| 93 | Nov. | Felix 42 | Agrippa II. 45 | Nero 39 | 846 |
| 94 | Nov. | Felix 43 | Agrippa II. 46 | Nero 40 | 847 |
| 95 | Nov. | Felix 44 | Agrippa II. 47 | Nero 41 | 848 |
| 96 | Nov. | Felix 45 | Agrippa II. 48 | Nero 42 | 849 |
| 97 | Nov. | Felix 46 | Agrippa II. 49 | Nero 43 | 850 |
| 98 | Nov. | Felix 47 | Agrippa II. 50 | Nero 44 | 851 |
| 99 | Nov. | Felix 48 | Agrippa II. 51 | Nero 45 | 852 |
| 100 | Nov. | Felix 49 | Agrippa II. 52 | Nero 46 | 853 |
| 101 | Nov. | Felix 50 | Agrippa II. 53 | Nero 47 | 854 |
| 102 | Nov. | Felix 51 | Agrippa II. 54 | Nero 48 | 855 |
| 103 | Nov. | Felix 52 | Agrippa II. 55 | Nero 49 | 856 |
| 104 | Nov. | Felix 53 | Agrippa II. 56 | Nero 50 | 857 |
| 105 | Nov. | Felix 54 | Agrippa II. 57 | Nero 51 | 858 |
| 106 | Nov. | Felix 55 | Agrippa II. 58 | Nero 52 | 859 |
| 107 | Nov. | Felix 56 | Agrippa II. 59 | Nero 53 | 860 |
| 108 | Nov. | Felix 57 | Agrippa II. 60 | Nero 54 | 861 |
| 109 | Nov. | Felix 58 | Agrippa II. 61 | Nero 55 | 862 |
| 110 | Nov. | Felix 59 | Agrippa II. 62 | Nero 56 | 863 |
| 111 | Nov. | Felix 60 | Agrippa II. 63 | Nero 57 | 864 |
| 112 | Nov. | Felix 61 | Agrippa II. 64 | Nero 58 | 865 |
| 113 | Nov. | Felix 62 | Agrippa II. 65 | Nero 59 | 866 |
| 114 | Nov. | Felix 63 | Agrippa II. 66 | Nero 60 | 867 |
| 115 | Nov. | Felix 64 | Agrippa II. 67 | Nero 61 | 868 |
| 116 | Nov. | Felix 65 | Agrippa II. 68 | Nero 62 | 869 |
| 117 | Nov. | Felix 66 | Agrippa II. 69 | Nero 63 | 870 |
| 118 | Nov. | Felix 67 | Agrippa II. 70 | Nero 64 | 871 |
| 119 | Nov. | Felix 68 | Agrippa II. 71 | Nero 65 | 872 |
| 120 | Nov. | Felix 69 | Agrippa II. 72 | Nero 66 | 873 |
| 121 | Nov. | Felix 70 | Agrippa II. 73 | Nero 67 | 874 |
| 122 | Nov. | Felix 71 | Agrippa II. 74 | Nero 68 | 875 |
| 123 | Nov. | Felix 72 | Agrippa II. 75 | Nero 69 | 876 |
| 124 | Nov. | Felix 73 | Agrippa II. 76 | Nero 70 | 877 |
| 125 | Nov. | Felix 74 | Agrippa II. 77 | Nero 71 | 878 |
| 126 | Nov. | Felix 75 | Agrippa II. 78 | Nero 72 | 879 |
| 127 | Nov. | Felix 76 | Agrippa II. 79 | Nero 73 | 880 |
| 128 | Nov. | Felix 77 | Agrippa II. 80 | Nero 74 | 881 |
| 129 | Nov. | Felix 78 | Agrippa II. 81 | Nero 75 | 882 |
| 130 | Nov. | Felix 79 | Agrippa II. 82 | Nero 76 | 883 |
| 131 | Nov. | Felix 80 | Agrippa II. 83 | Nero 77 | 884 |
| 132 | Nov. | Felix 81 | Agrippa II. 84 | Nero 78 | 885 |
| 133 | Nov. | Felix 82 | Agrippa II. 85 | Nero 79 | 886 |
| 134 | Nov. | Felix 83 | Agrippa II. 86 | Nero 80 | 887 |
| 135 | Nov. | Felix 84 | Agrippa II. 87 | Nero 81 | 888 |
| 136 | Nov. | Felix 85 | Agrippa II. 88 | Nero 82 | 889 |
| 137 | Nov. | Felix 86 | Agrippa II. 89 | Nero 83 | 890 |
| 138 | Nov. | Felix 87 | Agrippa II. 90 | Nero 84 | 891 |
| 139 | Nov. | Felix 88 | Agrippa II. 91 | Nero 85 | 892 |
| 140 | Nov. | Felix 89 | Agrippa II. 92 | Nero 86 | 893 |
| 141 | Nov. | Felix 90 | Agrippa II. 93 | Nero 87 | 894 |
| 142 | Nov. | Felix 91 | Agrippa II. 94 | Nero 88 | 895 |
| 143 | Nov. | Felix 92 | Agrippa II. 95 | Nero 89 | 896 |
| 144 | Nov. | Felix 93 | Agrippa II. 96 | Nero 90 | 897 |
| 145 | Nov. | Felix 94 | Agrippa II. 97 | Nero 91 | 898 |
| 146 | Nov. | Felix 95 | Agrippa II. 98 | Nero 92 | 899 |
| 147 | Nov. | Felix 96 | Agrippa II. 99 | Nero 93 | 900 |
| 148 | Nov. | Felix 97 | Agrippa II. 100 | Nero 94 | 901 |
| 149 | Nov. | Felix 98 | Agrippa II. 101 | Nero 95 | 902 |
| 150 | Nov. | Felix 99 | Agrippa II. 102 | Nero 96 | 903 |
| 151 | Nov. | Felix 100 | Agrippa II. 103 | Nero 97 | 904 |
| 152 | Nov. | Felix 101 | Agrippa II. 104 | Nero 98 | 905 |
| 153 | Nov. | Felix 102 | Agrippa II. 105 | Nero 99 | 906 |
| 154 | Nov. | Felix 103 | Agrippa II. 106 | Nero 100 | 907 |
| 155 | Nov. | Felix 104 | Agrippa II. 107 | Nero 101 | 908 |
| 156 | Nov. | Felix 105 | Agrippa II. 108 | Nero 102 | 909 |
| 157 | Nov. | Felix 106 | Agrippa II. 109 | Nero 103 | 910 |
| 158 | Nov. | Felix 107 | Agrippa II. 110 | Nero 104 | 911 |
| 159 | Nov. | Felix 108 | Agrippa II. 111 | Nero 105 | 912 |
| 160 | Nov. | Felix 109 | Agrippa II. 112 | Nero 106 | 913 |
| 161 | Nov. | Felix 110 | Agrippa II. 113 | Nero 107 | 914 |
| 162 | Nov. | Felix 111 | Agrippa II. 114 | Nero 108 | 915 |
| 163 | Nov. | Felix 112 | Agrippa II. 115 | Nero 109 | 916 |
| 164 | Nov. | Felix 113 | Agrippa II. 116 | Nero 110 | 917 |
| 165 | Nov. | Felix 114 | Agrippa II. 117 | Nero 111 | 918 |
| 166 | Nov. | Felix 115 | Agrippa II. 118 | Nero 112 | 919 |
| 167 | Nov. | Felix 116 | Agrippa II. 119 | Nero 113 | 920 |
| 168 | Nov. | Felix 117 | Agrippa II. 120 | Nero 114 | 921 |
| 169 | Nov. | Felix 118 | Agrippa II. 121 | Nero 115 | 922 |
| 170 | Nov. | Felix 119 | Agrippa II. 122 | Nero 116 | 923 |
| 171 | Nov. | Felix 120 | Agrippa II. 123 | Nero 117 | 924 |
| 172 | Nov. | Felix 121 | Agrippa II. 124 | Nero 118 | 925 |
| 173 | Nov. | Felix 122 | Agrippa II. 125 | Nero 119 | 926 |
| 174 | Nov. | Felix 123 | Agrippa II. 126 | Nero 120 | 927 |
| 175 | Nov. | Felix 124 | Agrippa II. 127 | Nero 121 | 928 |
| 176 | Nov. | Felix 125 | Agrippa II. 128 | Nero 122 | 929 |
| 177 | Nov. | Felix 126 | Agrippa II. 129 | Nero 123 | 930 |
| 178 | Nov. | Felix 127 | Agrippa II. 130 | Nero 124 | 931 |
| 179 | Nov. | Felix 128 | Agrippa II. 131 | Nero 125 | 932 |
| 180 | Nov. | Felix 129 | Agrippa II. 132 | Nero 126 | 933 |
| 181 | Nov. | Felix 130 | Agrippa II. 133 | Nero 127 | 934 |
| 182 | Nov. | Felix 131 | Agrippa II. 134 | Nero 128 | 935 |
| 183 | Nov. | Felix 132 | Agrippa II. 135 | Nero 129 | 936 |
| 184 | Nov. | Felix 133 | Agrippa II. 136 | Nero 130 | 937 |
| 185 | Nov. | Felix 134 | Agrippa II. 137 | Nero 131 | 938 |
| 186 | Nov. | Felix 135 | Agrippa II. 138 | Nero 132 | 939 |
| 187 | Nov. | Felix 136 | Agrippa II. 139 | Nero 133 | 940 |
| 188 | Nov. | Felix 137 | Agrippa II. 140 | Nero 134 | 941 |
| 189 | Nov. | Felix 138 | Agrippa II. 141 | Nero 135 | 942 |
| 190 | Nov. | Felix 139 | Agrippa II. 142 | Nero 136 | 943 |
| 191 | Nov. | Felix 140 | Agrippa II. 143 | Nero 137 | 944 |
| 192 | Nov. | Felix 141 | Agrippa II. 144 | Nero 138 | 945 |
| 193 | Nov. | Felix 142 | Agrippa II. 145 | Nero 139 | 946 |
| 194 | Nov. | Felix 143 | Agrippa II. 146 | Nero 140 | 947 |
| 195 | Nov. | Felix 144 | Agrippa II. 147 | Nero 141 | 948 |
| 196 | Nov. | Felix 145 | Agrippa II. 148 | Nero 142 | 949 |
| 197 | Nov. | Felix 146 | Agrippa II. 149 | Nero 143 | 950 |
| 198 | Nov. | Felix 147 | Agrippa II. 150 | Nero 144 | 951 |
| 199 | Nov. | Felix 148 | Agrippa II. 151 | Nero 145 | 952 |
| 200 | Nov. | Felix 149 | Agrippa II. 152 | Nero 146 | 953 |
| 201 | Nov. | Felix 150 | Agrippa II. 153 | Nero 147 | 954 |
| 202 | Nov. | Felix 151 | Agrippa II. 154 | Nero 148 | 955 |
| 203 | Nov. | Felix 152 | Agrippa II. 155 | Nero 149 | 956 |
| 204 | Nov. | Felix 153 | Agrippa II. 156 | Nero 150 | 957 |
| 205 | Nov. | Felix 154 | Agrippa II. 157 | Nero 151 | 958 |
| 206 | Nov. | Felix 155 | Agrippa II. 158 | Nero 152 | 959 |
| 207 | Nov. | Felix 156 | Agrippa II. 159 | Nero 153 | 960 |
| 208 | Nov. | Felix 157 | Agrippa II. 160 | Nero 154 | 961 |
| 209 | Nov. | Felix 158 | Agrippa II. 161 | Nero 155 | 962 |
| 210 | Nov. | Felix 159 | Agrippa II. 162 | Nero 156 | 963 |
| 211 | Nov. | Felix 160 | Agrippa II. 163 | Nero 157 | 964 |
| 212 | Nov. | Felix 161 | Agrippa II. 164 | Nero 158 | 965 |
| 213 | Nov. | Felix 162 | Agrippa II. 165 | Nero 159 | 966 |
| 214 | Nov. | Felix 163 | Agrippa II. 166 | Nero 160 | 967 |
| 215 | Nov. | Felix 164 | Agrippa II. 167 | Nero 161 | 968 |
| 216 | Nov. | Felix 165 | Agrippa II. 168 | Nero 162 | 969 |
| 217 | Nov. | Felix 166 | Agrippa II. 169 | Nero 163 | 970 |
| 218 | Nov. | Felix 167 | Agrippa II. 170 | Nero 164 | 971 |
| 219 | Nov. | Felix 168 | Agrippa II. 171 | Nero 165 | 972 |
| 220 | Nov. | Felix 169 | Agrippa II. 172 | Nero 166 | 973 |
| 221 | Nov. | Felix 170 | Agrippa II. 173 | Nero 167 | 974 |
| 222 | Nov. | Felix 171 | Agrippa II. 174 | Nero 168 | 975 |
| 223 | Nov. | Felix 172 | Agrippa II. 175 | Nero 169 | 976 |
| 224 | Nov. | Felix 173 | Agrippa II. 176 | Nero 170 | 977 |
| 225 | Nov. | Felix 174 | Agrippa II. 177 | Nero 171 | 978 |
| 226 | Nov. | Felix 175 | Agrippa II. 178 | Nero 172 | 979 |
| 227 | Nov. | Felix 176 | Agrippa II. 179 | Nero 173 | 980 |
| 228 | Nov. | Felix 177 | Agrippa II. 180 | Nero 174 | 981 |
| 229 | Nov. | Felix 178 | Agrippa II. 181 | Nero 175 | 982 |
| 230 | Nov. | Felix 179 | Agrippa II. 182 | Nero 176 | 983 |
| 231 | Nov. | Felix 180 | Agrippa II. 183 | Nero 177 | 984 |
| 232 | Nov. | Felix 181 | Agrippa II. 184 | Nero 178 | 985 |
| 233 | Nov. | Felix 182 | Agrippa II. 185 | Nero 179 | 986 |
| 234 | Nov. | Felix 183 | Agrippa II. 186 | Nero 180 | 987 |
| 235 | Nov. | Felix 184 | Agrippa II. 187 | Nero 181 | 988 |
| 236 | Nov. | Felix 185 | Agrippa II. 188 | Nero 182 | 989 |
| 237 | Nov. | Felix 186 | Agrippa II. 189 | Nero 183 | 990 |
| 238 | Nov. | Felix 187 | Agrippa II. 190 | Nero 184 | 991 |
| 239 | Nov. | Felix 188 | Agrippa II. 191 | Nero 185 | 992 |
| 240 | Nov. | Felix 189 | Agrippa II. 192 | Nero 186 | 993 |
| 241 | Nov. | Felix 190 | Agrippa II. 193 | Nero 187 | 994 |
| 242 | Nov. | Felix 191 | Agrippa II. 194 | | |

| | | | |
|------------|--|------------------------|---|
| Sep.
28 | Paul reaches Rome; Festus delivers the case. Death of Festus (about November). | Agrippa II. 13 | Nero 811 |
| Nov. | Paul reaches Rome; Festus delivers the case. Death of Festus (about November). | Agrippa II. 13 | Rebellion and defeat of Boadicea in Britain. |
| 61 | Paul reaches Rome; Festus delivers the case. Death of Festus (about November). | Agrippa II. 13 | Poppaea secures success to the Jewish embassy. |
| Feb. | Paul reaches Rome; Festus delivers the case. Death of Festus (about November). | Agrippa II. 13 | Declines the High-Priest. |
| March | Paul reaches Rome; Festus delivers the case. Death of Festus (about November). | Agrippa II. 13 | Birth of Pity the Younger. |
| begs | Paul reaches Rome; Festus delivers the case. Death of Festus (about November). | Agrippa II. 13 | |
| 803 | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | Nero 815 |
| An- | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | Death of Burrus, and retirement of Seneca. |
| tumn | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | Nero divorces Octavia and marries Poppaea. |
| | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | Murder of Octavia. |
| | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | June 9. |
| | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | Pallas and Doryphorus put to death. |
| | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | Great earthquake at Pompeii (Tae.), or in A.D. 63 (Seneca). |
| | Paul (54) a prisoner at ALBINUS, Procurator 14 | Agrippa II. 14 | Nero 810 |
| 63 | Early in the year Paul Albinus 15 | Agrippa II. 15 | His daughter born and dies. |
| | Early in the year Paul Albinus 15 | Agrippa II. 15 | War resumed by Corbulo. |
| | Early in the year Paul Albinus 15 | Agrippa II. 15 | His interview with Tiridates. |
| | Early in the year Paul Albinus 15 | Agrippa II. 15 | CINQUE, Legatus. |
| March | Early in the year Paul Albinus 15 | Agrippa II. 15 | |
| about | Early in the year Paul Albinus 15 | Agrippa II. 15 | |

TABLE VI. THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART II. THE APOSTOLIC HISTORY—continued.

| A.D. | PALESTINE AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD. | | OTHER PARTS. | SYRIA, EGYPT, AND THE EAST. | ROME. | A.U.C. |
|------|---|---|-------------------|--|---|--------|
| | CHRISTIANITY. | PROVINCE OF JUDEA. | | | | |
| 63 | Alluded to the recent persecutions of Ananias? Paul sails for Jerusalem: then visits Antioch, Colossæ, and Ephesus (Lewin). [Or, he goes to Asia, by way of Macedonia.— <i>C. & H.</i>] | | | | | 816 |
| 64 | ? Paul (56) sails with Titus to Crete; thence returns to Ephesus. Leaving Timothy there, he goes by way of Philippi to Corinth. <i>First Epistle to Timothy.</i> <i>Epistle to Titus</i> (Lewin.) Winters at Nicopolis. <i>First General Persecution.</i> | Agrippa removes Jesus, son of Damæus, and makes Jesus, son of Gamaliel, H.-P. Josephus (26) goes to Rome. Gessius Florus, <i>Precursor</i>1 From about Mid-summer | Agrippa II.....16 | Cestius Gallus, <i>Legatus</i> . | Nero.....11 Acts in the theatre at Naples. Returns to Rome. <i>Great Fire of Rome</i> , Jy. 19-24, ascribed by Nero to the Christians. Builds the Golden House. | 817 |
| 65 | ? Paul (57) goes to Dalmanis, through Macedonia, to Troas; to Ephesus, where he is arrested and sent to Rome by way of the Isthmus. Comforted by Onesiphorus. [In Spain.— <i>C. & H.</i>] | Gessius Florus.....2 Agrippa removes Jesus, and appoints Matthias H.-P. The <i>Temple of Herod</i> completed. The discharged workmen add to the general ferment in Judæa. | Agrippa II.....17 | Tiberiades, King of Armenia, starts for Italy. | Nero.....12 The Olympia (Ol. 211.1) postponed for him. Conspiracy of Pison. Deaths of Seneca and Lucan. (Gallio put to death later.) <i>Quinquennalia</i> , 2d time. Death of Poppæa. Plague and storms in Italy. | 818 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|----|---|-----|
| 66 | Paul's (66) first trial. Writes the <i>Second Epistle to Timothy</i> in the Jewish War begins with a conflict at Cæsarea on a Sabbath (Saturday, April 19). Massacre by Florus at Jerusalem (April 28). | 6 Agrippa II. 18 | Cæcina Fusus (prefect Nero of Egypt) put to death for using the bath prepared for Nero. | 19 | Triadates crowned by Nero. | 819 |
| 67 | June. <i>Martyrdom of St. Paul</i> (Lewin.)
Martyrdom of St. Peter, probably about this time.
[? Summer. Paul goes from Spaldis to Aem Minor.—C. & H.] | Geulius Florus.
The Jews seize Antonia (July 25).
Romans retire into Herod's forts (Aug. 15).
Murder of Ananias (Aug. 16).
Massacres of Jews at Cæsarea and other cities.
Geulius Gallus advances on Jerusalem, and is attacked on the Great Sabbath of the Feast of Tabernacles (Sept. 22).
Encamps on Scopus and attacks the city (Oct. 8).
Defeated at Beth-horon (Oct. 16).
Sends the news to Nero in Greece. | Returns about the Feast of Tabernacles, and tries in vain to mediate. | 19 | Titus sent to Egypt to collect forces. | 820 |
| 68 | [Summer (?). Paul (66) writes <i>First Epistle to Timothy</i> from Macedonia.
Autumn. Writes the <i>Epistle to Titus</i> from Ephesus.
Winter at Nicopolis.— <i>Conybeare and Howson.</i>] | Geulius Florus
Veapasian is joined by Agrippa at Antioch, and advances to Ptolemais.
Agrippa takes Japhia in Galilee (Ju. 24).
Massacre of Samaritans by Cerealis (Ju. 26).
Jodapata taken (Ju. 29). Josephus prisoner.
Galilee subdued. Janina and Arotus taken.
Ptolemais, the last Hellenic, chosen by the Zealots.
Veapasian overruns the country. At Cæsarea, preparing for the siege of Jerusalem. Receives the news of Nero's death, near the end of the year. Sends Titus to congratulate Galba. | Agrippa II. 19
Titus takes Veapasian at Iotomula.
P. Lucinius Mucianus, prefect of Syria.
Cicchala taken by Titus. Veapasian at Cæsarea.
Titus, preparing for the siege of Jerusalem. Receives the news of Nero's death, near the end of the year. Sends Titus to congratulate Galba. | 20 | Titus returns from Rome. Nero returns to Rome in triumph near Olympic victor.
Nero's 14th year not completed.
Revolt of Vindex.
Galba (April 3) proclaimed in Spain.
Death of Nero (April 31).
Vitellius sent to Germany by Galba. | 821 |

TABLE VI. THE ROMAN DOMINATION.—PART II. THE APOSTOLIC HISTORY—continued.

| A.D. | CHRISTIANITY. | PALESTINE AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.
PROVINCE OF JUDEA. | OTHER PARTS.
SYRIA, EGYPT, AND
THE EAST. | ROME. | A.D.C. |
|------|--|--|--|--|--------|
| 50 | | <p>..... Agrippa II 21</p> <p>Goes to Rome; but on Otto's defeat, he returns to join Vespasian.</p> <p>Vespasian advances to Jerusalem, and encamps at Scopus (May 13).</p> <p>Returns to Caesarea, and there hears of the accession of Vitellius.</p> <p>Proclaimed at Caesarea (July 8).</p> <p>Retires to Berytus and Antioch.</p> <p>..... Lucius Mucianus to Italy.</p> <p>Proceeds to Alexandria to make preparations.</p> <p>The re-elite employed at Jerusalem in a conflict between the factions.</p> <p>The Zealots gain the upper hand.</p> | | <p>Jan. 1. Mutiny in Ger- many.</p> <p>Vitellius proclaimed by the legions Jan. 9</p> <p>Galba adopts Vespasian. 9</p> <p>Galba slain. 15</p> <p>Otho (3 months).</p> <p>Vitellius enters Italy.</p> <p>Battle of Bedriacum. Apr. 16</p> <p>and death of Otho.</p> <p>Vitellius (9 months) acknowledged by the Senate.</p> <p>Vespasian. 1</p> <p>proclaimed at Alexandria, at Caesarea, and Antioch. 8</p> <p>Mucianus marches on Rome. His victory at Cremona. 15</p> <p>Burning of the Capitol. Dec. 23</p> <p>Vitellius slain. 2</p> <p>Vespasian. 2</p> <p>Salts from Alexandria about April for Roman insurrection of Civilis in Gaul and Britain put down by Cerealis.</p> | 528 |
| 70 | <p>The Christians of Jerusalem return to Pella before the siege is formed.</p> <p>Apr. 13. Pasover.</p> <p>Aug. 6. Sunday.</p> <p>Sep. 2. Sunday (Dion.)</p> | <p>Titus advances from Alexandria to Caesarea. Reaches Jerusalem just before the Pasover, and encamps at Scopus. (For details of the siege, see chap. v. § 11.)</p> <p>(Burning of the Temple.</p> <p>The Upper City taken.</p> <p>Titus remains three days at the ruins, and proceeds to Caesarea, thence to Antioch; thence, passing by Jerusalem, to Alexandria; and thence sails to Rome.</p> | | | |

INDEX.

| ABGARUS. | ALEXANDRIA. | ANDROMACHUS. |
|---|--|---|
| <p>A.</p> <p>"Abgarus, king of Edessa," 675.</p> <p>Ablene, at the time of Herod, 81.</p> <p>Abtalion, Jewish rabbi, 78.</p> <p>Aceldama, 323.</p> <p>Acetum, 324.</p> <p>Achaia, its contributions for the poor in Jerusalem, 494. Mission of Timotheus and Erastus to, 507, 508.</p> <p>Achicus, with others, carries the epistle to the Corinthians, 512, 513.</p> <p>Acrocorinthus, the, 452.</p> <p>Actium, battle of, 81.</p> <p>Acts of the Apostles, not a complete apostolic history, 378. Its real purpose, 378. Break between it and the earliest ecclesiastical history, 378.</p> <p>—, chronology of the, 419–423. Conclusions of the, 533. Written by St. Luke, 687, 709. Its contents, 709, 710. Time and place at which it was written, 710, 711. Its genuineness, 710. Subject of the second part of the, 401, 402. Its relation to St. Paul's Epistles, 492.</p> <p>Adasa, battle of, 41.</p> <p>Adramyttium, port of, 161.</p> <p>Adria, sea of, 570.</p> <p>Adultery, Christ's answer when appealed to in the case of the woman taken in, 291.</p> <p>Ælia Capitolina, name bestowed upon new city of Jerusalem, 136.</p> <p>—, bishop of, mention of, 137.</p> <p>Ænon, 216.</p> <p>Agabus, predicts a famine, 433. Prophecies of, 539.</p> <p>Agora of Athens, Paul's discourses in the, 475.</p> <p>—, situation of the, 476.</p> <p>Agrippa, Herod's friendship with, 84.</p> <p>—, name of, introduced into</p> | <p>family of Aristobulus, 81. His connection with the Temple, 86. Joined by Herod, 87.</p> <p>"Agrippa, king," grandson of Herod, 98.</p> <p>—, St. Paul's defense before, 411, 557, 559. St. Paul's mode of addressing him, 412.</p> <p>— (see Herod Agrippa).</p> <p>'Ain et-Tabigha, 276.</p> <p>'Ain Yakub (see Well, Jacob's).</p> <p>Akiba, rabbi, armor-bearer to Bar-Cocheba, 135.</p> <p>Albinus, procurator of Judæa, 123. His character and policy, 123.</p> <p>Alcimus, high-priest, courts Demetrius, 42. Death of, 43.</p> <p>Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, pilgrimage of, 187.</p> <p>—, his conduct toward the Jews, 145. His desire for catholicity of worship, 146.</p> <p>—, leader of a sect, 612, 617.</p> <p>—, put forward by the Jews in the riot at Ephesus, 520.</p> <p>—, son of Aristobulus II., prisoner of Pompey, 68.</p> <p>Besieged by Gabinus, 68.</p> <p>Again revolts, 67. Killed, 69.</p> <p>—, son of Herod, education of, 84. Herod's jealousy of, 87. Death of, 89.</p> <p>—, son of Simon, 320.</p> <p>—, the brass-founder, 625, 626.</p> <p>—, the Great, interview of, with Zaddua, 15, 16. Death of, 17. His place in sacred history, 17, 18.</p> <p>—, Balas, his claim to the crown of Syria, 43. Nominates Jonathan to the high-priesthood, 43. Marries Cleopatra, daughter of Ptolemy Philometer, 44.</p> <p>— Jannæus, wars of, 63. Death of, 64.</p> <p>—, Tiberius, procurator of Judæa, 120.</p> <p>Alexandra, wife of Alexander Jannæus, 64.</p> | <p>Alexandra, daughter of Hircanus, 71. Her appeals to Cleopatra, 79. Death of, 82.</p> <p>Alexandria, persecution of the Jews in, under Caligula, 110, 111. Jews in, 145, 146. Their share in literature, 147. Literary school at, 147.</p> <p>Alexandrian party in the Corinthian Church, the, 515, 527.</p> <p>Alexandrians and Cyrenians representing the Jews of Africa, 391.</p> <p>Almond pool, the, 131.</p> <p>Alphæus or Clopas, 191.</p> <p>—, father of Matthew, 679, 680.</p> <p>—, James described as the son of, 282.</p> <p>Alypius of Antioch, 138.</p> <p>Ambivius, M., procurator of Judæa, 107.</p> <p>Ammianus Marcellinus, narrative of, 138.</p> <p>Ananel, high-priest under Herod, 79.</p> <p>Ananias and Sapphira, the story of, 386, 387.</p> <p>Ananias sent to rescue Judæa, 63.</p> <p>—, his mission, 414, 415.</p> <p>—, high-priest, Paul before, 545, 546. Comes to Cæsaræa, to accuse Paul before Felix, 549.</p> <p>Ananus, high-priest, takes the lead in the defense of Jerusalem against the Romans, 126.</p> <p>—, persecution by, allusion to in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 599.</p> <p>— (see Annas).</p> <p>Anastasiæ church of the, 138.</p> <p>Anata, 340.</p> <p>Anathema, occurs frequently in the ancient canons, 652.</p> <p>Ancyra, city of, 464.</p> <p>Andrew, follows Christ, 209. Commanded by Christ to let down his net, 234. Final call of, 235, 236. Affection of, 261.</p> <p>—, St., 663, 664.</p> <p>Andromachus, murder of, 17</p> |

ANDRONICUS.

Andronicus, bribed by Menelaus, 25. Put to death, 25. —, 534.
 Angel, an, delivers the Apostles from prison, 387.
 "— of the Church," 161.
 —, vision of an, at the sepulchre, 349.
 Angels, at the Ascension, predict the Second Coming of the Lord, 357.
 —, ministry of, to Jesus, 206.
 —, the two, sitting in the sepulchre, 351.
 Anilai (see Asinai).
 Anna, daughter of Phanuel, gives thanks for the advent of Christ, 186.
 Annas, Christ in the house of, 321.
 —, high-priest, 107.
 — or Ananus, high-priest, 123. His persecution of the Christians, 123.
 —, high-priest at the time of John the Baptist's appearance, 199.
 —, the high-priest, Peter and John before, 385.
 Annulus Rufus, procurator of Judæa, 107.
 Annunciation, date of the, 181.
 Anointing of Christ, 266, 267.
 Anthony (see Mark).
 Antichrist, mystery of, 615.
 Antigonus of Socho, 169.
 — Socho, founder of new synagogue, 20. Writer of the Mishna, 20. Palestine governed by, 20.
 —, son of Aristobulus II., prisoner of Pompey, 68. Escapes, 69. Repulsed by Herod, 70, 71. Marches upon Jerusalem, 71. Nominal sovereignty of, 71. Besieges Masada, 71, 72. Put to death, 72.
 —, son of John Hyrcanus, 50. Slain, 62.
 Antioch, becomes a centre of the Christian Church, 148. First Gentile church formed at, and name of Christian first heard at, 430. The Gospel preached to the Greeks at, 431. Its situation, 430. Paul and Barnabas at, 432, 441, 442. Paul and Barnabas driven from, 445. Return to, 447. Return again to, 456. The church at, the Holy Spirit speaks to, 438. Christians of, send relief to Judæa at the time of the famine, 483.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 14.
 —, king of Commagene, 118.
 — III., the Great, his war

APOSTLES.

with Ptolemy IV., 22. Becomes master of Coele Syria and Palestine, 23.
 Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, accession and character of, 23. His campaigns against Egypt, 25. Takes Jerusalem, 25. His persecution of the Jews, 25-27. His death, 28. Resistance of the Jews to, 24-28.
 — V. Eupator, succeeds his father, 39. Dies, 49.
 — VI. Theos, 45.
 — VII. Sidetes, defeats Tryphon, 47. Besieges Jerusalem, 49. His moderation, 50.
 Antipas banished to Gaul, 115.
 Antipater, his war against Aristobulus II., 65, 66. Appears before Pompey, 67. Governs Judæa, 68. Made procurator, 69. Poisoned, 70.
 —, son of Herod, his enmity toward his brothers, 87, 88. Conspires against the life of his father, 89. Brought to trial, 89. Death of, 90.
 —, son of Salome, pleads the cause of Antipas, 101.
 Antonio (see Baris).
 —, burned at the time of Cestius Gallus, 125.
 —, the, taken by the Romans, 132.
 Appeltes comes to Mattathias, 34.
 Aplo heads a Greek deputation, 112.
 Apocalypse, date of the, 644.
 Apocalypsis, meaning of the word, 713.
 Apocrypha, the, 154.
 Apollonius, governor of Coele Syria, 24. Sent to massacre the inhabitants of Jerusalem, 26, 27. Defeated by Judas Maccabæus, 36. Fights against Jonathan, 45.
 Apollos of Alexandria, 148.
 — and the Twelve Disciples who knew only the baptism of John, 503, 504.
 —, his concord with Paul in the reproofs addressed to the Corinthians, 513. His teaching, 515, 516.
 Apostasy, the Great, mentioned by St. Paul in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, 615.
 Apostles, Twelve, choice of the, 256, 259. Character of their office, 260. Their personal qualifications, 261. Lists of the, 262. Number

ARETAS.

of, corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel, 261, 262. Its symbolical meaning, 261. Attend Christ in his second circuit of Galilee, 267. Sent forth on their mission, 270. Their success, 270. Their solemn profession of their faith in Christ, 273. Their failure in healing a case of demoniacal possession, 279. Contest among them for precedence, 279. Disbelieve the news of the first appearance of Christ after the resurrection, 350, 351.
 Apostles, the assembled, Christ's appearance to, 353. His second appearance to them with Thomas, 353, 354. His third appearance to them, 354. Not separated from the other disciples, 355. Admonished by the Holy Spirit to prepare the written records of the life of Christ, 367. Miracles of the, 387. Their imprisonment and deliverance, 387. Before the Sanhedrim, 387. Scourged, 388. Continue to teach and preach Jesus, 388.
 Appii Forum, the Christians meet Paul at, 530.
 Aquila of Pontus, 148.
 — and Priscilla, St. Paul takes up his abode with, 483, 484. They incur the risk of martyrdom, 484. Sail with St. Paul from Cenchreae, 492. Remain at Ephesus, 493. Instruct Apollos, 503. At Rome, 534. At Ephesus, 613.
 Arabia, St. Paul retires into, 416.
 Archelaus, son of Herod the Great, 98. Named by Herod as his successor, 99. Succeeds him, 99. His entry into the Temple, 100. Sets out for Rome, 100. Established in his government by Augustus, 100. Effect of his succession on the parents of Christ, 99, 100. Popular distrust of, 102. Marries Glaphyra, 102. Banished to Vienna, 102.
 —, accession of, 189. Deposition of, 199.
 Archippus, Epistle addressed to Philemon jointly with, 590.
 Areopagus, discourse of St. Paul at the, 476-479.
 Aretas, espouses the cause of Hyrcanus II., 65.

| ARETAS. | BARNABAS. | BETH-HORON. |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Aretas, father-in-law of Herod Antipas. 103. Makes war upon him. 13. Seizes Damascus, 109.</p> <p>—, his war with Herod, 403.</p> <p>St. Paul's escape from, 416.</p> <p>Aristæus, 147.</p> <p>Aristarchus seized by the Ephesians, 519.</p> <p>— of the Thessalonians goes to Troas, 526. Accompanies St. Paul on his voyage to Rome, 561. Fellow-prisoner of Paul at Rome, 585.</p> <p>Aristæus, letter of, giving an account of the origin of the Septuagint, 152.</p> <p>Aristobulus I., son of John Hyrcanus, 50. Assumes the title of king, 62.</p> <p>— II., defeats the Pharisees, 65. Attacked by Antipater and Aretas, 65, 66. Offers bribes to Rome, 66. Taken prisoner by Pompey, 67. Again a prisoner of Rome, 69. Murdered, 69.</p> <p>—, grandson of Aristobulus II., 71. Death of, 79.</p> <p>—, son of Herod, education of, 84. Herod's jealousy of, 87. Death of, 89.</p> <p>—, writings of, 147.</p> <p>Ark in the Synagogue, 160.</p> <p>Armenia, Jews in, 145.</p> <p>Artapanus, 147.</p> <p>Artemis, temple of, levelled with the ground through the agency of St. John, 663 (see Diana).</p> <p>Ascension, Mount of the, 338, 339.</p> <p>—, the, 356, 357.</p> <p>Asceticism, Paul's argument against, 559. Opposition to, 615, 616.</p> <p>Ashdod (see Azotus).</p> <p>Asia, St. Paul and his companions forbidden to preach the Gospel in, 432, 463.</p> <p>Diffusion of the Gospel in, 565.</p> <p>— Minor, St. Paul in, 462, 463. Heresy in, 614.</p> <p>Asiarcha, the, 519.</p> <p>Asinai and Anilai, revolt of, 114.</p> <p>Asmonæan dynasty, 44, 45.</p> <p>— family, table of the, 59.</p> <p>— house, last ruler of the, 71, 72.</p> <p>— kingdom established by Aristobulus, 52.</p> <p>— monarchy founded, 62.</p> <p>— princes, 34.</p> <p>Asmonæans, cruelty of Herod toward the, 78.</p> <p>Ass, the, fetched for Christ by the disciples, 304.</p> | <p>Assidæans, the sect of, 35, 36.</p> <p>Astarte, temple erected at Jerusale'm to, 136.</p> <p>Athenaus, his persecution of the Jews, 27.</p> <p>Athenians, character of the, 475.</p> <p>Athenobius, 48.</p> <p>Athens, Paul at, 474.</p> <p>—, plan of, 477.</p> <p>—, the sermon at, 478.</p> <p>—, converts at, 480.</p> <p>Attalia, port of, Paul and Barnabas at, 447.</p> <p>Augustus, title of, 83.</p> <p>—, Herod's sons brought before, 87. His celebrated saying about Herod, 90. Herod's legacy to, 99. Death of, 107.</p> <p>—, census made by, 184.</p> <p>Auranitis (see Ituræa).</p> <p>Azarias defeated by Gorgias, 18.</p> <p>Azotus (Ashdod), Philip at, 398.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B.</p> <p>Babylon, First Epistle of Peter written from, 636. Jews at, 636. Jews of the Dispersion at, 145.</p> <p>Bacchides, defeated by Judas Maccabæus, 37. Sent to support Alcimus, 42. Defeats Judas, 48. Attacks Jonathan, 43. Fortifies Jericho, 43. Makes peace with Jonathan, 43.</p> <p>Bagoas, Persian satrap, 15.</p> <p>Baptism of John, whether a new institution, 200. Accepted by the mass of the people, 201.</p> <p>— of the Proselytes of Righteousness, 150.</p> <p>—, origin of, 150. Commanded by Christ, 155.</p> <p>Barabbas, his release demanded by the people instead of that of Christ, 325, 326.</p> <p>Baradaeus, Jacob, bishop of Edessa, 674.</p> <p>Bar-Cocheba, leader of the Jews under Hadrian, 135. Coins of, 136.</p> <p>Baris, tower of, 50.</p> <p>—, fortress of the, 63.</p> <p>Bar-Jesus (see Elymas).</p> <p>Barnabas of Cyprus, 148. Self-sacrifice of, 386. Brings Saul to the Apostles, 417. Sent to Antioch, 431. Seeks out Saul at Tarsus, 431. With Saul at Antioch, 432. Whether at Jerusalem at the time of the deliverance of Peter from prison, 432,</p> | <p>423. His mission to Jerusalem, 433. Separated with Saul for the mission to the Gentiles, 436. One of the Apostles, 437. His first missionary journey with Paul, 437 (see Paul). Considered by the people at Lystra to be Jove, 446. His return journey with Paul, 447, 448. Separates from Paul, and goes with John Mark to Cyprus, 459. An Apostle, 683. His character and labors, 683. Epistle of, 684.</p> <p>Barnabas, proposed with Matthias as an Apostle, 380.</p> <p>Bartholomew, call of, 209. His confession of Christ, 209. Supposed to be the Nathanael of St John, 262, 679.</p> <p>Baruch, Book of, 150.</p> <p>Barzaphernes, Parthian commander, 71.</p> <p>Bashan, under Herod, 81.</p> <p>Basilica, the, erected on the spot where the cross is said to have been found, 137.</p> <p>Batanea, under Herod, 81.</p> <p>Baten el Hawa, 339.</p> <p>Bath and cradle of Jesus, 116.</p> <p>Bath-col, the, 203. Heard by Saul, 411.</p> <p>Batlainm, office of the, 162.</p> <p>Beattitudes, Mount of, the, 260.</p> <p>"Beautiful" gate, miracle at the, 34.</p> <p>Belt-lahm, town of, 165.</p> <p>Bel and the Dragon, 157.</p> <p>Bema, the, 124, 327.</p> <p>Benedictus, the, 182.</p> <p>"Berea," camp at, 42.</p> <p>Berenice, married to Aristobulus, son of Herod, 87.</p> <p>—, sister of Herod Agrippa II., 119.</p> <p>— (Tripoli), Jews at, 147.</p> <p>Bernice, sister of Agrippa, 556.</p> <p>Beroea, noble-mindedness of the Jews at, 473, 474.</p> <p>Bethanara, place of Christ's baptism, 216.</p> <p>Bethany, the family at, 296, 297. Situation of, 297. Meaning of the name, 297. The Sabbath spent at, 360. Feast at, date of, 313. Christ leads his disciples to, 359. The Apostles led by Christ before his ascension to, 357. (See Bethanara.)</p> <p>Bethel, fortified by Bacchides, 43.</p> <p>Bether, fortress of, defended by the Jews, 136.</p> <p>Bethesda, miracle at the pool of, 244, 245.</p> <p>Beth-horon, fortified by Bacchides, 43.</p> |

| BETHLEHEM. | CHARISMATA. | CHRIST. |
|--|--|--|
| Bethlehem, account of, 135.
Birth of Christ at, 184.
Massacre of the babes in, 90, 91. Present church of, 135.
Bethlehem-Judah (<i>see</i> Bethlehem, account of).
Bethphage, site of, 304. Meaning of the name, 304, 305.
Bethsaida, position of, 209. Jesus repeats the doom of woe upon, 290. Site of (<i>see</i> Capernaum).
Bethsura, town of, 37. Fortified by Judas Maccabæus, 38. Besieged by Antiochus V., 39.
Bezetha, suburb of, 116.
Bir-el-Yakûb (<i>see</i> Well, Jacob's).
Bir es-Samariyeh (<i>see</i> Well, Jacob's).
Birket Israil, 131. Considered to be the modern representative of Bethesda, 244.
Bishop, St. James's position equivalent to that of, 670.
Bithynia, St. Paul forbidden to enter, 462, 464.
Boanerges, surname of James and John, 232. The name, 657, 665.
Bread, unleavened, day of, 314, 315.
Brethren of the Law, 281, 282.
Britain, the evangelization of, 623.
Burrus, prefect of the Prætorian Guard, Paul delivered up to, 583. Death of, 587. | Calaphas, Joseph, high-priest, 107. Deposed, 103.
—, the high-priest, his argument for Christ's death, 239.
—, the high-priest, Peter and John before, 385.
Calligula, his favor toward Herod Agrippa, 104. Banishes Pilate, 109. His conflict with Judaism, 109, 110. His interview with the Jews, 112, 113. His death, 114. Judæa under (<i>see</i> Judæa).
Callirhoë, baths of, 89.
Calvary, 329.
Cana, marriage feast at, 209. Miracle at, 211, 212. Second visit of Christ to, 227, 228. Site of, 209.
Canaan, woman of (<i>see</i> Syro-Phœnician).
Candace, queen of Ethiopia, 397.
Canon of Old Testament, when closed, 15, 20. Importance of Antiochian persecution in fixing the, 53. The Hebrew, commentaries upon, 151.
Capernaum, Jesus appears at, 233. Jesus repeats the doom of woe upon, 290. Marked out by prophecy as the chief scene of the Messiah's ministry, 229. Return of Jesus to, 241. Site of, 214, 251.
Capharsalama, Nicanor defeated at, 41.
Cappadocia, Jews of, 145.
Carpus, St. Paul leaves his books with, 626.
Carthage, Council of, ratifies the Canon of the New Testament, 700.
Cassius, governor of Syria, 70.
"Castor and Pollux," the ship in which Paul embarked from Malta, 578.
Cenchree, harbor of, 482. Paul's vow at, 492. Church at, 493.
Cendebeus, 49.
Census made at the time of the birth of Christ (<i>see</i> Cyrenius).
Centurion, confession of the, 335. Servant of the, healed, 264.
Cephas, faction of, in the Corinthian Church, 527 (<i>see</i> Peter).
Cestius Gallus, prefect of Syria, 619.
Cetrus, the river, 440.
Châbôr, 186.
Chagigah, the, 324, 343.
Charismata, the, 162. | Charoseth, the, 341.
Chasidim (<i>see</i> Assideans).
Chazzân, office of the, 161.
Chelchias, sent to rescue Judæa, 63.
Children, Song of the Three, 157.
Chiliasmatic period of Apocalyptic interpretation, 793.
Chloë, those of the house of who bring bad news of the state of the Corinthian Church, 509.
Chonæ (<i>see</i> Colossæ).
Chorazin, Jesus repeats the doom of woe upon, 290. Site of (<i>see</i> Capernaum).
Christ, bearing of Herod's acts and character on the coming of, 91, 92. Era of birth of, 91. Sent before Herod Antipater, 104. Antagonism of his preaching to the doctrines of the Pharisees, 165, 166. Birth of, 184. Proclaimed to the shepherds, 184, 185. Brought to the Temple and circumcised, 185. Carried into Egypt, 183. Brought to Nazareth, 189. His childhood and youth, 189, 190. Goes to Jerusalem to keep the Passover, 183. Found in the Temple, 190. Teaches in the Synagogue at Nazareth, 190. His abode at Nazareth till his thirtieth year, 191. His outer and inner life during this period, 191, 192. Baptism of, 201, 202. Place of the, 216. Proclaimed the son of God, 203. His temptation in the wilderness, 204-206. Resemblance between the forty days spent by him in the wilderness, and the forty days spent by Elijah at Horeb, and Moses on Mount Sinai, 203. Ministry of angels to, 206. At the marriage feast, 209, 210. His relations with Mary, 210. His first miracle, 211, 212. Conclusion of the more private opening of his ministry, 214. His short abode at Capernaum, 214, 215. Beginning of his ministry at Jerusalem at the Passover, 219. Purifies the Temple, 220. His prediction concerning the temple of his body, 221. His converts at the Passover, 222. His reserve in trusting them, 222. Leaves Jerusalem for the country of Judæa, and gathers converts, who are |
| C. | | |
| Cabbala, the, 613.
Cabi, made high-priest, 123.
Cæsar, assisted by Antipater, 69. Julius, death of, 70.
—, Paul's appeal to, 555.
—, the duce of, 308, 309.
—, the Gospel known in the household of the, 514.
Cæsarea, city of, 83. Massacre of Jews by Felix at, 121. Paul at, 533. Tumult between the Jews and the Syrian Greeks at, 551. Philip at, 398. Philip's ministry at, 630, 691.
Cæsarea-Philippi, city of, 84. Built by Herod Philip, 105. Christ at, 276.
Calaphas, Christ sent to, 321. Interrogates Christ, 322. High-priest at the time of John the Baptist's appearance, 199. House of, consultation of the Jews in the, 312. | | |

CHRIST.

baptized by his disciples, 223. Retires to Galilee, 224. His disciples at Sychar, 226. His reception in Galilee, 226. His rejection at Nazareth, 226, 227, 232, 233. Date of his public ministry in Galilee, 227. His second visit to Cana, 227. His second Galilean miracle, 227, 229. Proclaims the kingdom of heaven as at hand, 231. Teaches in the synagogues, 232. Proclaims himself as the Messiah, 232. His final call to Andrew and Peter, James and John, 235. Healing of the demoniac, 236-238. Healing of Peter's wife's mother, 239. His first circuit through Galilee, 239. Cure of leprosy, 240, 241. Returns to Capernaum, 241. Cures the paralytic, 242. Claims the divine prerogative of forgiving sin, 242. Performs various miracles, 243. Goes up to Jerusalem, 243. Heals the cripple at Bethesda, 244, 245. His first great doctrinal discourse, 245-247. Asserts his supremacy over the Sabbath, 245, 246. Claims his divinity, 245, 246. Scene of his ministry, 248, 249; its duration, 249, 250. The plots against his life, 247. Second period of his ministry in Galilee, 253. Defends his disciples for plucking corn on the Sabbath, 253, 254. Heals the man with the withered hand, 255. Plot of the Pharisees and Herodians against him, 255, 256. Retires to the shore of the Galilean lake, 255. His miracles there, 255. His preparations for organizing the Christian Church, 256. His choice of the Twelve Apostles, 253, 257. His sermon on the Mount, 262-264. Heals the servant of the centurion, 264. Restores the life of the son of the widow of Nain, 264. His message to John the Baptist in prison, 265. His testimony to John, 265. Reveals himself as a judge, 265. Anointed, 266, 267. Makes his second circuit of Galilee, 267. His controversy with the Pharisees, 268. Heals the blind and dumb demoniac, 268. The visit of his mother and brethren, 267. His parables, 268.

CHRIST.

Stills the storm, 263. Heals the man possessed of a legion of devils, 268. His second rejection at Nazareth, 269. His third circuit of Galilee, 269. Retires to a lonely spot on the lake, 271. His first miracle of the loaves and fishes, 271. Its effect on the Galileans, 272. The Galileans wish to make him King, 272. Walks upon the water, 272. His controversy, in which the people desire a new sign, 273. Watched by emissaries from Jerusalem, 274. Retires to Phoenicia and the Decapolis, 274. Heals the deaf and dumb, 274. His second miracle of the loaves and fishes, 274. His encounter with the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians, 275, 276. Ascends the Jordan to Caesarea-Philippi, 276. Demands full confession of faith from the disciples, 276. The "chief corner-stone" of the Church, 277. Reveals to the disciples the mystery of his death and resurrection, 277. His transfiguration, 278, 279. Renewed prediction of his passion, 279. His last return to Capernaum, 279. Sets a little child in the midst of the Apostles, 280. His ensuing discourse, 280. His final departure from Galilee, 280. Challenged by his brethren to show himself in Judaea, 289. His journey through Samaria and rejection there, 290. Expectation concerning, 290. Appears at the Feast of Tabernacles, teaching in the Temple, 290, 291. Proclaims himself the giver of the water of life, 291. The attempt to arrest him, 291. His decision in the case of the woman taken in adultery, 292. Another controversy with the Pharisees, 292. The witness to, 292. Attempt to stone him, 293. Heals the man blind from his birth, 293, 294. Declares himself the Light of the World, 293. Represents himself as the Good Shepherd, 295. At the Feast of the Dedication, 295. Jews again attempt to stone him, 295. Retires to Bethabara, 295. Raises Lazarus from the dead, 295, 296. In the

CHRIST.

home at Bethany, 297. Council held concerning, 298. Withdraws to Ephraim, 298. His return toward Jerusalem, 299. His denunciation of Herod, 299. His progress through Perea, 299, 300. Warns his disciples for the third time of his passion, death, and resurrection, 299. Recrosses the Jordan to Jericho, 300. Heals the two blind men, 300. Conversion of Zacchaeus, 300. Spends the Sabbath at Bethany, 300, 301. Prepares to present himself in the Temple at Jerusalem, 304. His reception at Jerusalem, 305, 306. His character as king, 305. Returns to Bethany, 306. His second cleansing of the Temple, 306, 307. The last day of his public teaching, 307-312. Inculcates faith and mutual forgiveness, 307. Asks the chief priests and scribes whether the baptism of John was from heaven or of man, 308. His parables concerning their rejection of him, 308. Devices to entrap him, 308, 309. Answers the Sadducees concerning the Resurrection, 308. His great commandment, 309, 310. Questions the Pharisees, 310. His denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, 310, 311. His lamentation over Jerusalem, 311. His praise of the poor widow, 311. His final departure from the Temple, 311. His prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the end of the world, 312. Tells his disciples the time of his betrayal, 313. Eats the Paschal Supper with them, 314-317. Washes the feet of the disciples, 316. Reveals the treachery of Judas, 317. Announces that his hour is come, 317. His commandment that they should love one another, 317. His prediction about Peter, 317, 318. Appoints to meet the disciples in Galilee after his resurrection, 318. His last discourse and intercessory prayer, 318. Goes out to the Mount of Olives, 318. His agony in the garden, 318, 319. Surrenders himself into the hands of the officers sent to take him,

| CHRIST. | CILICIA. | CORINTH. |
|---|---|--|
| 320. In the house of Anna, 321. Sent to Calaphas, 321. Interrogated by him, 322. Arraigned before the Sanhedrin, 322. His demeanour throughout his trial, 322. 323. Avows himself the Christ, the Son of God, 323. Brought before Pilate, 324. 325. Sent by him to Herod Antipas, 325. Yielded up by Pilate to the people, 326. Handed over to the Roman soldiers, 326. Pilate's last effort to save him, 326, 327. Sentence pronounced upon him by Pilate, 327. His crucifixion (see Crucifixion). His sayings from the cross, 330, 334. Confides his mother to John, 333. Portents following his death, 334, 335. Found already dead, 335. His side pierced, 335. Testimony of St. John, 336. Care of Pilate to ascertain the truth of his death, 336. His burial, 336. His first appearance after the resurrection, 350. His second appearance, 351. His third appearance, 352. His fourth appearance, 352, 353. His fifth appearance, 353. His sixth appearance, 353. 354. His seventh appearance, 354. His command to Peter and prediction of his martyrdom, 354. His eighth appearance, to the great body of his disciples, 354, 355. His commission to them, 355. His ninth appearance, 355. His last interview with the Apostles and his ascension, 356-358. The prophecy of his second coming, 357. The destruction of Jerusalem completes the first advent of, 646. Prophecies of, 646, 647. The epoch of the fall of Jerusalem the type of his second coming, 649. Account of his resurrection (see Resurrection). First disciples of, 208. Genealogy of 192-194. Date of his birth, 194, 195. Life of, chronology of, 153, 350. Titles of, given by John the Baptist, 207; by Nathanael, 209. Christ, Spina (see Rhamnus). Christian Church, preparations for organizing the, 256. Name of, first heard at Antioch, 430, 432. Christianity, corruptions of, 613, 614. Establishment of, | at the epoch of the fall of Jerusalem, 644-650. Christianity in Europe, date of its introduction, 459. Influence of the dispersion on the promulgation of, 148. Proselytism of the Pharisees paving the way for the diffusion of, 168. Christians depart from Jerusalem before the siege, 129. Persecuted by Nero, 620. First general persecution of the, 621. Persecution of the, by Anna, 123. —, Asiatic, desertion of the, 624. Chronological Tables of New Testament History, 725-756. Chrysostom, writings of, concerning Paul's journey to Spain, 623. Church, Alexandrine, 146. —, Christian, acting as a court of arbitration, 164. Beginning of the, 208. Beginning of positive institutions in the, 388, 389. General persecution of the, 396. Its position at the death of Tiberius, 399. Worship of, similar to that of the Synagogue, 162. —, establishment of the, 614. — of Christ, full establishment of the, in the Holy Land, etc., recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, 378. Foundation of the, 378. Two sections of the primitive, 379. The great body of believers first seen in public as, 379. Modeled on the Jewish congregation, 379. — of the Sepulchre of the Virgin, 338. —, Primitive, four elements in the daily life of the, 383. State of the, 384. United Christian prayer in the, 385. —, moral corruption in the, 618. —, the whole, at Jerusalem, discusses the great question raised by the Judaizing spirit, 450, 451. —, assembly of the, 451. Decision of the, 451. Its significance, 456. The Assembly wrongly called the First Council, 455. Churches of Judæa and Galilee and Samaria, rest and prosperity of, 419. Cilicia, Paul and Silas visit, 459. Province of, at the time of St. Paul, 404. | Cilicians, mention of the, in the controversy between Stephen and the Hellenistic Jews, 391. Clauda, island of, 565. Claudia, conversion of, 626; her supposed British origin, 626. Claudius, accession of, 115. His edict for the toleration of the Jewish religion, 115. His policy in the East, 117. 118. Banishes the Jews from Rome, 121. Death of, 495. Clemens of Rome, 153. Clement at Rome, his writings concerning the persecution of the Christians, 622. Concerning Paul's journey to Spain, 622, 623. Clementines, the, 624. Cleobius, 399. Cleodemus or Malchus, 147. Cleopas, Christ's appearance to, 352, 353. Cleopatra married to Ptolemy, 23. Her relations with Herod, 79. Cloisters of the Temple of Herod, 94, 95. Clopas, 516. (See Alphaeus.) Cnidus passed by Paul on his voyage to Rome, 562. Coele-syria, the dowry of Cleopatra, 23. Coins of Simon, 57, 58. Collections for the poor in the Christian Church, 501, 502. Colossæ, the Church at, 507. Colossians, Epistle to the, written at Rome, 586. Its contents, 587-589. Corruption from Judaism, 583. Supreme headship of Christ 588. Community of goods in the Primitive Church, 586. Conception, the miraculous, 180, 182, 183. Constantine destroys the Temple of Astarte at Jerusalem, 137. Converts, the three thousand, on the Day of Pentecost, 383. Coponius, procurator of Judæa, 106, 107. Corban, Pilate's appropriation of the, 108. —, the, following the baptism of proselytes, 159. Corbulo, Domitius, prefect of Syria, 551-555. Corinth, its importance in the history of Paul, 481. The old Greek city and the new Roman colony, 482. Its population of Greeks, Romans, and Jews, 482. St. Paul at, |

| CORINTHIAN CHURCH. | DISCIPLES. | DUMVIRI. |
|---|--|--|
| <p>530. St. Paul at, after his first imprisonment, 618.</p> <p>Corinthian Church, opposition party to Paul in the, 527.</p> <p>State of the, 518, 509, 515.</p> <p>Corinthians, many of them believe and are baptized, 488.</p> <p>—, First Epistle to the, 509.</p> <p>Its date and place, 512.</p> <p>Contents and spirit of the, 516-518.</p> <p>—, Second Epistle to the, date of the, 523. Question of an intermediate Epistle, 524. Character and contents of the, 525.</p> <p>Cornelius, conversion of, 396, 399. Mission of St. Peter to, 418, 429.</p> <p>Costabaras, husband of Salome, 82.</p> <p>Cotys, king of the Lesser Armenia, 118.</p> <p>Council held concerning Jesus, 298.</p> <p>—, the First General Assembly at Jerusalem, wrongly so-called, 456.</p> <p>Councils, the, 163.</p> <p>Covenant, New (<i>see</i> Testament).</p> <p>—, division of the history of the, 177.</p> <p>—, Old, sacrifice of the, 315.</p> <p>Crassus pillages the Temple, 69.</p> <p>Crate, connection of Titus with, 694-696. Moral corruption at, 618. Paul at, after leaving Rome, 611.</p> <p>Crio, Cape (<i>see</i> Cnidus).</p> <p>Cripple, healing of the, at Bethesda, 244, 245.</p> <p>Crispus, the baptism of, 483.</p> <p>Cross, form of the, used in crucifixion, 344.</p> <p>—, St. Andrew's (<i>see</i> Crucifixion).</p> <p>—, St. Anthony's (<i>see</i> Crucifixion).</p> <p>Crucifixion, account of the, 329-334. Manner of the, 329, 330. Place of the, 330. Time of the, 331. Sayings of Christ during the, 331-334. Portents following the, 334, 335.</p> <p>—, among the Romans, manner of, etc., 344, 345.</p> <p>Crux, commissura, the, 344.</p> <p>—, decussata, the, 344.</p> <p>—, innimica, the, 344.</p> <p>Cumanius Ventidius, procurator of Judea, 120.</p> <p>Cyprus, mother of Herod, 70.</p> <p>Cyprus, Barnabas and Saul at, 438, 439. Settlement of Jews in, 145.</p> <p>Cyrene, Jews at, 147.</p> | <p>Cyrenians and Alexandrians, representing the Jews of Africa, 391.</p> <p>Cyrenius and the Census, 195.</p> <p>— (<i>see</i> Quirinius).</p> <p>D.</p> <p>Dalmanutha, 275.</p> <p>Danai's conversion of, 480.</p> <p>Damascus, Jews numerous at, 403.</p> <p>—, St. Paul's ministry at, 415, 416.</p> <p>Daniel, book of, 54. Visions of, 54.</p> <p>David, son of, Christ comes as the, 304.</p> <p>David's son, how is Christ at once, and Lord, 310.</p> <p>Deacons, the seven men called, 690, 691.</p> <p>—, appointment of the, 390.</p> <p>Their zeal, 390.</p> <p>Decapolis, multitudes drawn by the fame of Christ's teaching and miracles from, 230. Under Herod, 82. What consisting of, 276.</p> <p>Dedication, Feast of the, 37 (<i>see</i> Feast).</p> <p>Demas, companion of Paul in his imprisonment at Rome, 585. Apostasy of, 628.</p> <p>Demetrius, 147.</p> <p>—, leader of the party at Ephesus against the teaching of Paul, 518.</p> <p>—, Eucerus, king of Syria, 64.</p> <p>—I., Soter, becomes king, 41. Supports Alcimus, 42. His overtures to the Jews, 43, 44. His death, 44.</p> <p>Demetrius II., Nicator, accession of, 45.</p> <p>Demoniac, healing of the, 236-239.</p> <p>—, the blind and dumb, healed, 268.</p> <p>—, the Gadarene, 269.</p> <p>Demoniacal possession, question of, 236, 237.</p> <p>Demoniac, account of, 236, 237. Healing of many, 239.</p> <p>Derash, the, 163.</p> <p>Derbe, Paul and Barnabas at, 446, 447.</p> <p>—, site of, 446.</p> <p>Dialium, origin of the, 62.</p> <p>Diana, worship of, at Ephesus, 518, 519.</p> <p>Dicarchia (<i>see</i> Puteoli).</p> <p>Dichachm, the, value of, 279.</p> <p>Dionysius, the Areopagite, conversion of, 480.</p> <p>Disciples of Christ, first, 207.</p> | <p>Effect of the first miracle upon them, 213.</p> <p>Disciples, the, Christ gives them their first commission to begin their work, 317. Their voyage across the lake, 272. Some of them forsake Christ, 273. Development of their faith, 276. Its full profession, 276.</p> <p>—, three descend with Jesus to the world beneath, 279.</p> <p>—, Seventy, sent forth by Christ during his progress through Samaria, 289, 290.</p> <p>—, the, raise the question at the Last Supper as to which of them should be the greatest in the kingdom of which Christ had spoken, 316.</p> <p>—, at the Last Supper, 316-318. Christ comforts them, 318.</p> <p>—, flee when Christ is taken by the officers of the Temple, 320. Re-assemble after their dispersion, and look forward to the third day, on which Jesus had foretold his resurrection, 337, 338.</p> <p>—, Christ's appearance to the great body of his, 354, 355.</p> <p>—, apostles not separated from the other, 355.</p> <p>Discourse, doctrinal, Christ's first great, 245-247.</p> <p>Dispersion, African, the, 147.</p> <p>—, Eastern, Jews of the, 626.</p> <p>—, origin of the, 144. Extent of the, 145.</p> <p>—, restoration of privileges to Jews of the, 87.</p> <p>—, the, its influence on the promulgation of Christianity, 148.</p> <p>Divinity of Christ asserted by himself in his first great discourse, 245, 246.</p> <p>—, asserted about the tribute-money, 279.</p> <p>Dor (<i>see</i> Dora).</p> <p>Dora, city of, 48.</p> <p>Dorcas, the raising of, 427, 428.</p> <p>Doris, wife of Herod, 87.</p> <p>Dositheus, 399.</p> <p>Drusilla, sister of Herod Agrippa II., 120, 191.</p> <p>—, wife of Felix, 549, 551.</p> <p>Duration of our Lord's ministry, 249, 250.</p> <p>Dumviri or prætors, Paul and Silas before the, 463.</p> |

| EAGLE. | ET-TABIGHAIL | FIG-TREE. |
|---|---|---|
| E. | En-Názirah (see Nazareth). | Et-Talyibeh (see Ephraim). |
| Eagle , Golden, affair of the, 88. | Enoch , book of, 54. | Eubulus , conversion of, 626. |
| "Easter Day," 303, 348. | Epaphras , fellow-prisoner of Paul at Rome, 585. His teaching in Colossæ, 587. | Eunice , mother of Timothy, 460. |
| Easter Eve , 337. | Epaphroditus , bearer of the Epistle to the Philippians, 586, 587. Whether the same as Epaphras, 588. | Eupolemus , sent to Rome, 41, 147. |
| Ecclesia , Christian, the; its organization resembling that of the synagogue, 162. | Brings the contributions of the Christians at Philippi to Paul at Rome, 594. | Euroclydon , the, 564. |
| Ecclesiasticus , Book of, 156. | Ephesian Church , state of the, as shown in the Epistles to Timothy, 613, 614. Church organization, 612. Heresies in the, 613. | Europe , St. Paul's call to, 464, 465. |
| Edessa , Church of, 675. | — elders, Paul's discourse to the, 537. | Eutychus , restored to life, 537. |
| —, Petrine tone in Christian school at, 636. | —, Epistle to the, written at Rome, 586, 592, 594. Points in common with the Colossians, 592. Its special and sublime teaching, 592, 593. Question as to whether it was really written to the Ephesians, 602-606. | Evangelists , inspiration of the, 370, 371. |
| Egypt , campaigns of Antiochus against, 25. | Ephesus , Paul at, 503. The church of, 503. Riot at, raised by Demetrius, 518-521. Paul's labor at, after leaving Rome, 610. Factional opposition against Paul at, 612. Paul probably arrested at, 624. Paul's voyage to, 493. St. John at, 661. | —, the first three, their Galilean sources of information, 220, 229, 230. Their inspiration, : 30. |
| El-'Azariyeh , or Lazarieh, 297. | —, the centre of the active life of Eastern Christendom after the destruction of Jerusalem, 705. | —, the four, gospels of, 178. |
| Elders , appointment of, as permanent officers, 448. | Ephrath (see Bethlehem). | —, the term, 684. |
| —, college of, 161. | Epicureans , Paul encountered by the, 475. | Ezekiel , tragedy of, 147. |
| "Eleasa," camp at, 42. | Epimenides , verses of, 619. | "Ezra, the Apocalypse of," 155. |
| Elcazar , a chief scribe, martyrdom of, 27. | Epistles , the seven Catholic or general, 713-719. | Ezra the scribe , 173. |
| —, high-priest, 21. | Equites (see Publicans). | |
| —, made high-priest, 102. | Erastus , chamberlain of Corinth, 530. | F. |
| —, leads the seditious party in the Temple at the time of Florus, 125. | —, his mission to Macedonia and Achæa, 507, 508. | Fadus , Cuspius, procurator of Judæa, 120. |
| —, heads, with John of Giscala, a party in Jerusalem, 128. | Esdra , first book of, 155. Second book of, 165. | Fair Havens , Paul at, 563. |
| —, son of Mattathias, 34. His self-devotion, 39. | Essenes , name of the, 171. Their organization and doctrines, 172, 173. Their settlements, 173. Under Herod, 84, 91. | Faith , demand of Christ for, 231. Moral power of Christ's miracles chiefly shown in exciting and rewarding, 243. |
| Eleven , the, receive the tidings of the first appearance of Christ after the resurrection, 350. The specially appointed witnesses of Christ's resurrection, 354, 355. | Essenism , tendency toward, 92. | Famine in Judæa, relieved by the Christians of Antioch, 433. |
| "Ell," considered by the people as a call for the prophet, 333. | Father , book of, 153. | Fast , Great Jewish, at the time of Paul's voyage to Rome, 533. |
| Eliashib , the high-priest, 15. | Ethiopian eunuch , conversion of the, 397, 398. Date of the, 339. | Feast given by Matthew, 242. |
| Elijah appears in the Transfiguration, 278, 279. Christ affirms his having already come in the person of John the Baptist, 279. Prophecy of his coming, 92. | Ethnarch , title of, given to Archelaus, 102. | — of Tabernacles, approach of the, 283, 290. Christ appears at the, 291. Last day of the, 291. |
| Elisaiyeh , 340. | Et-Tabighah (see Capernaum, site of). | — of the Dedication, Christ at the, 295. |
| Elizabeth , mother of John the Baptist, 180, 181. Visited by Mary, 182. | | — of the Jews, when Jesus went up to Jerusalem, 243. |
| El-Medjel , 268. | | Felix , Procurator of Judæa, 121, 122. His treatment of St. Paul, 122. |
| Elohim , how construed in Hebrew and Samaritan Pentateuch, 153. | | —, governor of Judæa, despotism of, 494. Paul sent to, 548. His treatment of Paul, 548-551. Recalled to Rome, 551. |
| Elymas , the sorcerer, St. Paul's judgment on, 489. | | Fellowship in the primitive Church, 384. |
| Emmanuel , Isaiah's prophecy concerning the birth of, fulfilled, 184. | | Fenius Rufus , 535. |
| Emmaus , fortified by Bacchides, 43. | | Festus Porcius , procurator of Judæa, 122, 551. His judgment on St. Paul, 122. Paul's defense before him, 554, 555. Promises to send Paul to Cæsar, 556. |
| —, the journey to, 552. | | Fig-tree , parable of the barren, 263, 306, 307. |
| Engedi , wilderness about, John the Baptist in the, 199. | | |

| FLOECUS. | GLAPHYRA. | GREEKS. |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Florus, Gessius, procurator of Judæa, 123-125.
 Fortunatus, with others, carries the epistle to the Corinthians, 512, 513.
 Fountain of the Virgin at Nazareth, 196, 197.
 Friday, Good, 322.
 Furcifer, the term, 845.</p> | <p>the darkness of, 477. Origin of the name, 233, 234, 251.
 Galilee, reduced by Vespasian, 127.
 —, Sea of, Christ at the, 233. Description of, 233, 234.
 — (see Viri Galilæi).
 —, submits to John Hyrcanus, 10.
 —, the scene of Christ's appearance to the great body of his disciples, 354, 355.
 Gamaliel, grandson of Hillel, 175.
 —, his advice to the Council, 387, 398. The teacher of St. Paul, 415. Contrast of his solitary appearance in the Acts with the course chosen by St. Paul, 345. His counsels of toleration, 407.
 Garments of Christ, divided among the soldiers, 331.
 "Gate, Beautiful," the, 95.
 "Gate, Water," the, 95.
 Gaulonites, under Herod, 81.
 Gaza made a Roman town, 102.
 Gazara, 48, 49.
 Gazzith, the hall, 74.
 Gemara, the, 151, 251.
 Genealogy of Christ (see Christ).
 Gennesareth, Sea of (see Galilee).
 Gentile Church, first, formed at Antioch, 430.
 — converts, emancipation of the, declared by the Church at Jerusalem, 454.
 —, the first, 428.
 Gentiles, first formal declaration that the offer of salvation, rejected by the Jews, was handed over to them, 442, 444.
 —, the mission to the, 436, 437.
 Gerizim, temple of, profaned, 26. Temple at, 141, 142.
 Gessius Florus in Judæa, 619.
 Gethsemane, description of, 338.
 —, Garden of, Christ's agony in the, 318, 319.
 —, situation and size of, 318.
 Gezer or Gazer (see Gazara).
 Gilend, strongholds of, taken by Judas Maccabæus, 87.
 Giscala, John of, son of Levi, escapes to Jerusalem, 126. Heads a party at Jerusalem, 123. His defense of Jerusalem, 131, 132. His flight, 134.
 Glaphyra married to Alexan-</p> | <p>der, son of Herod, 87.
 Married to Archelaus, 102.
 Gnostic philosophy in the Church at Colossæ, 588, 589.
 Gnosticism, 651. Alliance between Judaism and, 618.
 —, Simon as a teacher of, 397.
 —, teaching of, 617.
 God, Unknown, the altar at Athens to, 478.
 Golden House, the, of Nero, 120.
 Golgotha, 320.
 Gorgias marches against the Jews, 36. Defeats them, 38.
 Gorpiæus at the siege of Jerusalem, 134.
 Gospel harmony, difficulties of, 226, 227. Concerning the interval in our Lord's life between the Feast of Tabernacles and the Passover, 296.
 — history, beginning of the, according to the four Evangelists, 178.
 — narrative, a break in the, 314.
 — proclaimed to the shepherds, 184, 185.
 Gospels, the four, their genuineness, 360. Their relation to each other, 360-363. The language in which they are written, 362. Theories of their origin, 363-366. Probability that they were based on apostolic preaching, 366-370. Harmony of the, 361, 362, 369, 371, 372. Their inspiration, 370, 371. Table of the harmony of the, 373-376.
 —, writers of the, when styled Evangelists, 654.
 Grave-clothes, order of the, 350.
 Graves, opening of the, after the Crucifixion, 335.
 Greek becomes a universal language in Western Asia, 21.
 — Empire in Asia, 14.
 — of the New Testament, the, 699, 700.
 Greeks at Antioch, the Gospel preached to the, 430.
 — in the Roman Church, 533.
 — of Cæsarea, under Felix, 122.
 — or Gracians in the Church (see Hellenists).
 —, St. John's relation of the coming of certain, 311.</p> |
| G. | | |
| <p>Gaba, fortress of, under Herod, 83.
 Gabbatha, 827.
 Gabinus, proconsul of Syria, 68, 69.
 Gabriel appears to Zacharias, 180. Appears to Mary, 180, 181.
 Gadara, Christ's miracle in, 269. Tombs of, 269. Made a Roman town, 102.
 Gaius, baptism of, 488. Seized by the Ephesians, 519. Paul the guest of, 530.
 — of Derbe, goes to Troas, 536.
 Galaaditis, extent of, under Herod, 81.
 Galatia, churches of, 464. Judaizing teachers in the, 502, 503. Journey of Paul through, 462, 463.
 Galatians, St. Paul's Epistle to the, refuting the Judaizing heresy, 503. Date of, 503, 504.
 Galilean cities, denunciation of the, 205.
 —, Jesus repeats the doom of woe upon, 290.
 Galileans, liberty of the Gospel proclaimed to them first, 229. Wish to make Jesus king, 272.
 Galilee, account of, 251. Beginning of Christ's public ministry in, 228, 229. Christ's appearance to the Apostles after his resurrection by the lake of, 354. Christ's first circuit through, 239. Christ makes his second circuit of, 267. Christ retires to, 225, 226. His reception in, 226. Christ's second period of ministry in, 253. Christ's third circuit of, 279.
 —, Christians of, 370.
 —, extent of, under Herod, 81.
 —, inhabitants of, despised by the people of Judæa, 106.
 — of the Gentiles, light of the Gospel revealed amid</p> | | |

HADRIAN.

H.

Hadrian, revolt of the Jews under, 135, 136. Razes the ruins left by Titus to the ground, 136.
 Hæmus, clans of, 466.
 Hagiographa, the, 54.
 Hak ed-damm, 323.
 Hallel, cup of the, 342.
 "Hallel, Great," the, 318.
 Hallel, the, 342, 343.
 Handel, oratorio of, 42.
 Haphtaroth, the, 161.
 Hauran, desert of the, 81.
 Headship of Christ, the, 588, 589, 592.
 Heathenism, state of, at the time of St. Paul, 431.
 Heathens, Paul's first discourse to mere, 443.
 Hebrews, Epistle to the, written at the close of Paul's first imprisonment, 596. Internal proofs of Pauline authorship, 597, 598. Allusions to the persecution by Ananias, 599. Indications of time and place and of the writer's intention, 598-600. The writer is contemplating a visit to Jerusalem, 601, 602. Its canonical authority, 711. Its authorship, 712. To whom sent, 712. Time and place at which it was written, 712. Language in which it was written, 713. Condition of the Hebrews and scope of the Epistle, 713.
 — in the Church, 388. Their dissensions with the Hellenists, 389.
 Hebron, reduced by Judas Macabæus, 39.
 Hegesippus, his tradition respecting St. James, 671.
 Heifer, red, ceremony of the burning of the, 340.
 Helcias, treasurer of the Temple, heads an embassy to Rome, 584.
 Helena, mother of Constantine, visits Palestine, 137.
 —, palace of, burned, 134.
 —, queen of Adiabene, imports corn into Jerusalem, 120.
 —, tomb of, 120.
 —, the Empress erects a sacred house on the Mount of Olives, 339.
 —, with Simon Magus, 470.
 Heliadorus, attempt of, to seize the treasures of the Temple, 23.

HEROD.

Hellenism, influences of, 21, 22.
 Hellenistic Jews, Stephen's controversy with the, 331.
 Hellenists in the Church, 329. Their dissensions with the Hebrews, 388.
 —, Syrian Jews become, 145.
 Hellenizing tendency at Alexandria, 145-147.
 Heresies in the Church, 613-617.
 Heresy, the term, 165.
 Heretics, St. Paul's command to Titus to deal firmly with, 617.
 Hermogenes, desertion of the Asiatic Christians, led by, 624.
 Hermon, Mount, whether the scene of the Transfiguration, 286.
 Herod Agrippa I., charges his uncle with treason, 104.
 —, grandson of Herod the Great, uses his influence for the Jews, 114. Made governor of Tiberias, 115. Favor of Caligula toward, 115. Receives Judæa from Claudius, 91. His visit to the Temple, 115, 116. His murder of St. James, 116. Solicits the recall of Vibius Marsus, 118. His death, 118.
 —, king of Judæa, beheads James and imprisons Peter, 431. His death, 432.
 — Agrippa II., made a tetrarch, 119. Succeeds to the government of the Temple, 119. His connection with St. Paul, 119. Comes into collision with the Jews at Jerusalem, 122. Seeks to calm the people, 125.
 — Antipas, son of Herod the Great, marries Herodias, 98. First named by Herod as his successor, 99. Made tetrarch, 99. His position confirmed by Augustus, 99. His importance derived from his appearance as the hearer and murderer of John the Baptist, and as taking part in the condemnation of our Lord, 102, 103. His character, 104. Banished by Caligula, 104. Sends for John the Baptist, 223. Imprisons him, 224. Orders the execution of John the Baptist, 265. Jesus brought before, 325. Believes Jesus to be John restored to life, 270.
 —, king, grandson of Herod the Great, 98.

HESHBON.

Herod, king of Chalcis, 118.
 —, ruler of the house of, 14.
 —, son of Antipater, made governor of Galilee, 69, 70. Made governor of Coele Syria, 70. Made tetrarch, 71. Defeats Antigonus, 71. Made king of Judæa, 71. Besieges Jerusalem, 72. Established on the throne of Judæa and surnamed the Great, 73. His policy, 78, 79. Summoned by Mark Antony, 79. His campaign against Malchus, 83. Secures the favor of Octavian, 82. Extent of his kingdom, 81, 82. Orders the execution of his wife, 82. Institutes Greek and Roman customs, 82. Builds Caesarea, 83, 84. His sons, 84. Friendship with Agrippa, 84. Courts the people of Greece, 84. Restores the Temple, 85, 86. His jealousy of his sons, 87, 88. Antipater conspires against his life, 88. His illness, 89. Orders the massacre of the babes, 90. His death, 90. His character, 91. Bearing of his acts and character on the coming of Christ, 92, 93.
 —, family of, 98, 99.
 —, temple of, 94-96.
 —, will of, 99. Funeral of, 100, 101.
 —, the tetrarch (see Herod Antipas).
 — Philip, son of Herod the Great, marries Herodias, 98. Excluded from benefit of his father's will, 99. Pleads the cause of Archelaus, 101.
 Herods, ancestry of the, 77.
 Herod's fears at the birth of Christ, 187-189. Commands the massacre of the male children, 189. His death, 188.
 Herodias, her fatal influence, 103-105. Wife of Herod Antipas, excites her husband against John the Baptist, 224. Her resentment against John the Baptist, 265.
 Herodian family, pedigree of the, 75.
 Herodians, Christ's encounter with the, who ask for a sign, 275, 276. Origin of the party of the, 78. Plot with the Pharisees against Christ, 255. The, 93, 94, 166.
 Herodium, the, 100.
 Heshbon, fortress of, under Herod, 83.

HEZEKIAH.

Hezekiah, pool of, 131.
 High-priest deprived of supreme power by Gabinius, 68. Most important person in the state, 14. Robes of the, custom about the, 106.
 High-priesthood, interruption of succession to, 56. Of Jerusalem, passes out of the line of Jozadak, 40.
 High-priests under Herod I. and his successors, 78.
 Hillel, school of, 174.
 —, the Elder, 145.
 Hippicus, tower of, 86.
 Hippo, made a Roman town, 102.
 Holy Ghost, baptism of, 207. Descent of the, 203, 381, 382. The, commands the separation of Saul and Barnabas from the Church at Antioch for the mission to the Gentiles, 436.
 Holy Land, progress of the Gospel in the, 396. (See Judæa.)
 Holy Spirit, gift of the, 381. Inward and external gifts of the, 381. New outpouring of, after the release of Peter and John, 386. Promise of the, 355, 356. Teachings of the, 367.
 Hosannas of the people at the entry of Christ into Jerusalem, 306.
 Hymenæus, leader of a sect, 612. Teaches that "the resurrection is passed already," 613. How Paul writes of him, 617. His heresy, 651, 652.
 Hyrcania, prison of, 84.
 Hyrcanus, John, acts of, 49. Succeeds his father in the priesthood, 49. Marches against Jericho, 49. Gives up Jerusalem, 59. His successes, 50. Joins the Sadducees, 51.
 —, son of Alexander Jannæus, succeeds to the high-priesthood, 65. Nominally succeeds to the throne as Hyrcanus II., 65. His cause espoused by Antipater, 65. Offers bribes to Rome, 66. Restored by Pompey, 66-68. Made ethnarch, 69. Gained over by Herod, 70. Death of, 71.

I.

Iconium, Paul and Barnabas at, 445, 446.

JASON.

Idumæa, under Herod, 81.
 Idumæans, compelled to adopt the Jewish religion, 59. Embrace Judaism, 77. Forcible conversion of the, 149.
 Ignatius at Antioch, 153. One of the Apostolic Fathers, 642.
 Inspiration of the Evangelists (see Evangelists).
 Ipsus, battle of, 18.
 Irenæus at Lyons, 153.
 —, disciple of Polycarp, 642.
 Ishmael, the high-priest, heads an embassy to Rome, 594.
 Isidore, one of the accusers of Flaccus, 113.
 Ituræa, under Herod, 81.
 Ituræans, forcible conversion of the, 149.

J.

Jaddua, the high-priest, 14. His interview with Alexander the Great, 15, 16.
 Jairus, restoration to life of the daughter of, 243.
 James, charged by Christ to watch in the garden, 318, 319. Energy of, 262.
 —, Epistle of, its genuineness and canonicity, 713. Its author, 714. Time and place at which it was written, 714. Its object, 714, 715.
 —, Paul's interview with, at Jerusalem, 540.
 —, St., arraigned before the Sanhedrim, 123.
 —, the Little, 281.
 —, St., the Less, Christ's appearance to, 355. One of the pillars of the Church, 355. His identity with James the son of Alphaeus, and James the brother of our Lord, 668. Called to the apostolate, 668. Christ appears to him, 669. His high position in the Church, 669, 670. Tradition concerning him, 671-673. Tomb of, 673.
 —, the son of Zebedee, 664. The name of Boanerges given to him and St. John, 666. His martyrdom, 667.
 —, final call of, 235.
 —, whether brother of the Lord, 281, 282.
 Jamnia, Gorgias attacked at, 38. Taken by the Romans, 127.
 Jason, brother of the high-priest Onias III., obtains the high-priesthood, flees to

JERUSALEM.

the Ammonites, 24. Attacks Jerusalem, 25.
 Jason of Cyrene, five books of, Second of Maccabees based upon the, 157, 158.
 —, Paul supposed to be in the house of, 471, 473.
 —, son of Eleazar, sent to Rome, 41.
 Jehudah, Rabbi, 121.
 Jericho, fortified by Bacchides, 43.
 —, Pompey at, 67.
 Jerome, writings of, concerning Paul's journey to Spain, 623.
 Jerusalem attacked by Jason, 25. Taken by Antiochus, 26.
 —, beginning of Christ's public ministry at, 219.
 —, besieged by Antiochus V., 39. Besieged by Herod, 72.
 —, bishops of, 137.
 —, Christ's lamentation over, 299. Christ's last appearance to the Apostles at, 356. Christ's prophecy of the destruction of, 312. Christ repeats his lamentation over, 311.
 —, Church of, 129. Its government in the hands of James, 625.
 —, destruction of, 134, 135. Later history of, 135. Insurrection at, under Hadrian, 135. Ruins left by Titus razed to the ground, 136. Entered by Pompey, 67, 68. Entered by Alexander the Great, 16.
 —, epoch of the fall of, 644-650. Prophecy of the siege of, 648. This epoch the type of the second coming of Christ, 650.
 —, extension of, at the time of Agrippa, 116. Plan of, 118. Factions in, 127. Famine at, in the time of Paul, 120.
 —, general dispersion of the disciples from, on account of persecution, 396. Its importance throughout the wars of the Maccabees, 52. Fifth visit of St. Paul, to, 540.
 —, Paul's visit to the Church, at the feast, at, 493.
 —, possession of, secured by Judas Maccabæus, 37. Riots at, under Pilate, 108. State of, before its destruction, 123. Siege of, 129-134. Taken by Ptolemy, 19.
 —, the Church at, confirms

JERUSALEM.

St. Peter's admission of the Gentiles into the Church, 429. Gives a cordial reception to Paul and Barnabas, 447. The first visit of St. Paul to, after his conversion, 416, 417. The 120 brethren at, 379. The mission of Barnabas and Saul to, 432, 433.

Jerusalem, tower of, reduced by Simon, 47. Wall of, built during the siege by the Romans, 132. Works at, carried on, under Herod the Great, 86.

Jesus (Joshua) son of Damneus, high-priest, 123.

—, name given to the Saviour, 185 (see Christ).

—, the son of Sirach, eulogy of, 20. The Wisdom of, 156 (see Ecclesiasticus).

Jewish exorcists, defeat of the 506, 507.

— monarchy, end of the, 102.

— war, beginning of, 125.

Jews, preparation for understanding state of, at opening of the New Testament, 14. Alleged participation of, in revolt of Sidonians, 15. Privileges of, said to have been granted by Alexander the Great, 16. A large number of, removed to Egypt, 17. Influence of Greece upon the, 19.

— of Egypt, influence of Hellenism on, 21. Persecuted by Ptolemy IV., 23. Privileges under Antiochus, 24.

— and Spartans, alleged kindred between, 25. Persecuted by Antiochus IV., 26.

—, silence of Greek and Roman historians about the, 29, 30. Extinction of royalty among the, 31. Their independence under the Maccabees, 34.

—, Transjordanic, removed to Jerusalem, 38.

—, Galilean, removed to Jerusalem, 38.

—, divisions among the, at time of Demetrius I., 40. Their league with Rome against Syria, 41. Courted by Demetrius I. and Alexander Balas, 43, 44. Under the Maccabees, 52, 53. Rebellion of the, against Alexander Jannæus, 63. Their influence in Egypt, 63. Under Herod, 78, 79. Moral

JEWS.

degradation of the, at the time of Herod, 91. History of, after the death of Herod, 92, 93. Secular history of the, after the death of Herod, 98. Their fury against Sabinus, 101. Their influence at Rome after the death of Herod, 101. Religion of, proscription of, at Rome, under Tiberius, 110. Under Caligula, persecution of the, 110, 111. Their treatment under Caligula, 111–114. Interview of the, with Caligula, 112, 113. Under Claudius, 115. Banished from Rome by Claudius, 120. Under Flavius, 124, 125. Beginning of their war with Rome, 126. Their revolts in Cyrenaiica, Egypt, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia, 125. Forbidden to reside at Jerusalem, 136. Under Julian, attempt to build a temple, 138. Opposition of Samaritans to the, 141. Their treatment of the Samaritans, 142. Egyptian, importance of the, under the Ptolemies, 146. Of Palestine, proselytism of the, 148, 149. Demand a sign, 221. Their indignation at Christ's assertion of his power to confer spiritual life, 246. Prosperity of the, from the second to the seventh century, 251. Emissaries of rulers, the, watch Christ in Galilee, 253. Mention of, in the records of Christ's controversial teaching, 273. Press Jesus to tell them plainly whether he was the Christ, 295. They again attempt to stone him, 295. Alternative offered to them for the last time between the acceptance and rejection of their spiritual king, 305. Consult how they can secure Christ, 312. Their impotence to execute the sentence of condemnation on Christ, 324. Accept the responsibility of Christ's death, 326.

Jews, enumeration in the "Acts" of the provinces and regions in which they were found, 382. Their assembling at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, 388. Their cry to Peter and the Apostles, 383. Reform of their selfish rapacity, 384. Their custom to teach every

JOHN.

youth some trade, 405. Form a conspiracy against St. Paul, 416. The Gospel always offered to them first by the Apostles on their missionary journeys, 433. Contradict Paul, 444. Their anger at their association with the Gentiles as receivers of the same Gospel, 445.

Jews, at Thessalonica, stir up the people against Paul, 471. Pursue him to Berea, 474.

—, at Corinth, their fury against St. Paul, 488. Their tumult against St. Paul, 490, 491.

—, Roman, early propagation of Christianity among the, 533.

—, their plot against St. Paul's life, 548.

—, at Rome, Paul's two conferences with the, 582, 583. Their rejection of the Gospel, terminating the first stage in the history of its foundation, 583.

—, prophecy of their future restoration in the Epistle to the Romans, 583.

Joachim (Jachmus), appointed high-priest (see Alcimus).

Joanna, wife of Chuza, 268. Her visit to the sepulchre, 349.

Joaza, high-priest, displaced by Archelaus, 102.

Joazar, made high-priest, 89. High-priest, prudence of, 107.

Joel, fulfillment of the prophecy of, 383.

Johanan (see Jonathan).

John Mark, the nephew of Parnabas, 432, 433. Accompanies Barnabas and Saul in their first missionary journey, 437, 438. Desertion of, 441. His subsequent relations to Paul and Peter, 441. Paul refuses to take him on his second missionary journey, 459. He accompanies Barnabas to Cyprus, 459. (See Mark.)

—, St., follows Christ, 108. His deep insight into Christ's teaching, 230. His office of recording a special aspect of our Lord's ministry, 244. Doctrinal discourses of our Lord in, 245, 246. His omission of the Sermon on the Mount, 256. His energy united with his spirit of love, 261. Sent to prepare the

| JOHN. | JOPPA. | JUDÆA. |
|---|---|---|
| <p>last supper, 316. His presence at it, 317. Charged by Christ to watch in the garden, 319. Remains when the other disciples flee, 320. Remains beside the cross of Christ, 333. His visit to the sepulchre, 350. One of the pillars of the Church, 355. His title of "elder," 717. At the conferences at Jerusalem about the Judaizing spirit in the Church, 451. Survives the fall of Jerusalem, 655. His early life, 656, 657. His friendship with Simon Bar-jonah, 657. His life with Christ, 657. The name Boanerges given to him and his brother, 657. His association with Peter, 658. Account of him in the Acts, 653. His departure from Judæa, 650. At Ephesus, 661. Exiled to Patmos, 661. Traditions of St. John, 661. Legend and time of his death, 662. His title of "Theologus," 662, 663. Undertakes to write the Gospel, 684.</p> <p>John, First Epistle of, its authenticity, 716. Time and place at which it was written, 716. Its object, 716. Doubtful passages, 716, 717.</p> <p>—, Second and Third Epistles of, their authenticity, 717. To whom addressed, 717. Their object, 717. Beginning of the Gospel history according to, 178.</p> <p>—, Gospel of, supplemental to the other three, 220; mark of this, 223; another instance of this, 226. No parables in the, 285. Its authority, 707. Place and time at which it was written, 707. Its occasion and scope, 708. Its contents and integrity, 708. Its genuineness, its relation to the other Gospels, etc (<i>see</i> Gospels).</p> <p>—, Revelation of, 644.</p> <p>— and Peter heal the lame man at the "Beautiful" gate of the Temple, 394. Their appearance before the Sanhedrim, 385. Their close connection, 385. Confer on the converted Samaritans the gift of the Holy Ghost, 397.</p> <p>—, second son of Simon, made captain of the host,</p> | <p>47. His victory over the Syrians, 49 (<i>see</i> Hyrcanus). John, son of Mattathias, 34. Killed, 43.</p> <p>—, son of Zebedee, final call of, 235.</p> <p>— the Baptist, remonstrates with Herod Antipas, 103. His birth announced by the angel Gabriel, 180. Born, 182. His name decided, 182. Vowed a Nazarite, 183. His youth passed in the deserts, 183. In the wilderness about Engedi, 199. Appears in public, 199. Date of appearance, 199. His preaching of repentance, 200. His baptism, 200. His addresses to different classes, 201. Believed in by the mass of the people and by the publicans, 201. His predictions of the Messiah, 202. Baptizes Christ, 202, 203. Continues to prepare the people to receive Christ, 203. Appealed to by the priests and Levites to tell them who he was, 207. Proclaims Christ as the Lamb of God, 207. At Ænon, 223. His final testimony to Christ, 224. Appears before Herod Antipas, 224. Imprisoned, 224. Distinction between his preaching and that of Christ, 231, 232. Last notice of, before his death, 264. His disciples come to tell him of the deeds of Christ, 264. Christ's message to, 264. His death, 265. Christ's testimony to, 265. The heresy maintaining him to be the Messiah, 504, 505.</p> <p>Jolada, the high-priest, 14.</p> <p>Jonah, the sign of the prophet, 275.</p> <p>Jonah's three days' confinement in the fish made a type of our Lord's burial, 268.</p> <p>Jonathan, high-priest, 121. Killed, 121.</p> <p>—, the high-priest, 14. Slays his brother, 15.</p> <p>—, son of Annas, made high-priest, 109.</p> <p>—, son of Mattathias, 35, 38. Chosen leader, 43. Avenges his brother's death, 42. Makes peace with Rachides, 43. Nominated to the high-priesthood, 43. Burns Azotus, 45. Gains favor with Demetrius II., 45. Made prisoner by Tryphon, 46. Killed, 46.</p> <p>Joppa, commerce with Europe</p> | <p>through the port of, 47. St. Paul's converts at, 428. Taken by the Romans, 127.</p> <p>Joseph, betrothed to Mary, 180. Marries her, 181. Carries Jesus and Mary into Egypt, 183. His death, 191. His genealogy, 194.</p> <p>—, defeated by Gorgias, 38.</p> <p>—, his retreat to Galilee, 49.</p> <p>—, nephew of the high-priest Onias II., establishes a civil authority side by side with that of the high-priest, 22.</p> <p>— of Arimæthea, begs the body of Christ, 336.</p> <p>—, son of Antipater, 60. Killed, 80.</p> <p>—, steward of Herod, 80.</p> <p>— (<i>see</i> Josephus Flavius).</p> <p>Josephus, civil authority at the period after the death of Simon, 49.</p> <p>—, Flavius, the Jewish historian, 126.</p> <p>Joses, whether brother of the Lord, 281.</p> <p>Joshua, high-priest under Herod, 86.</p> <p>—, slain by his brother Jonathan, the high-priest, 15.</p> <p>—, son of Damneus (<i>see</i> Jesus).</p> <p>— (<i>see</i> Jason).</p> <p>Jotapata, defence of, 127.</p> <p>Judah Hakkodesh, Rabbi, 257.</p> <p>Judæa, becomes a Roman province, 102. Condition of, under Felix, 121. Christians of, 379. Christ's converts in, 323. Churches of, rest and prosperity of, 419. Description of, by Josephus, 144. Earthquake at, 80. Extent of, under Herod, 81. Famine and pestilence in, under Herod, 84. Famine in, 433. Finally freed from Syria, 50. Restored to its ancient limits under John Hyrcanus, 51. Greek customs first openly introduced into, 24. Independence of, under Asmonean princes, 14. Won by Judas Maccabeus, 41. Granted by Demetrius, 47. Its state at the time of St. Paul's fifth visit to Jerusalem, 542. Peace of, under Simon, 47. Position of, after the battle of Ipsus, 18. Reduced to an ordinary Roman province, 106. Relations of, to Rome, 14. State of, at the appearance of John the Baptist, 199. The Jews of, on the return from the Captivity,</p> |

| JUDAISM. | LAODICEAN. | LUKE. |
|---|---|--|
| 140. Under Caligula the rest of the churches viewed in relation to the state of, 423. Under Roman protection, 68. Under Maccabees, history of, passed over by Greek and Roman writers, 20. | Jude, Epistle of, its authorship, 718. Time and place at which it was written, 718. Its genuineness, 718. Object, 718. | In Colossians iv. 16, 598. Theory about the, 602-606. |
| Judaism, alliance between Gnosticism and, 613. Divided into sects, 19. Two forms of, infecting the Christian Church, 614. | Judge, Christ reveals himself as a, 265. | Laomedon governs Palestine, 19. |
| Judaizers at Jerusalem, Paul's opposition to, 494. Dangers from the, 540, 541. In the Church at Colosse, 537. In the Galatian churches, 502. St. Paul's life-long contest with, 455. | Judgment, the principle of, preached in the Sermon on the Mount, 263. | Lassa, ruins of, 564. |
| Judaizing spirit in the Church, 448, 449. Public discussion of the, 450, 451. | Judith, book of, 155. | Law, Christ proclaims that he comes to fulfill the, 263. |
| Judas Barnabas, sent to Antioch, 456. | Juhan, his design of restoring the Jewish worship on Mount Moriah, 133. | —, Jewish, discussion about the, 451. |
| —, brother of James, his resolve to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," 262. | Julian, city of, 105. | — of the New Dispensation, 263. |
| —, Iscariot, his love of the world, 262. Christ alludes for the first time to his treason, 273. Treason of, 312, 313. His presence at the Last Supper, 317. His traitor's kiss, 320. His remorse, 329. His suicide, 328. The sentence pronounced upon him by the Lord, 328. His place filled by Matthias, 676. | Julius has charge of Paul on the voyage when he is sent to Rome, 561. His conduct at the shipwreck, 576. Report of, at Rome, 581. | —, The (see Pentateuch). |
| —, Maccabæus, succeeds his father, 36. Gathers an army, 36. Defeats Nicanor, 16. Crosses the Jordan and slays 20,000 Syrians, 37. Defeats Lysias, 37. His descent on Joppa, 38. Burns Jamnia, 38. Marches into Gilead, 38. Compelled to retreat to Jerusalem, 39. Gains the Battle of Adma, 41. Makes a treaty with him, 42. His death, 42. | Junia, 534. | Lazarieh (see el-Azaryieh). |
| — of Galilee, revolt of, 588. | Jupiter Capitoline, temple erected at Jerusalem to the, 136. | Lazarus raised from the dead, 298. Effect of the miracle, 303. The Pharisees resolve to put him to death, 300. |
| —, son of Simon, his victory over the Syrians, 49. | Justification by faith in Christ no merely Pauline doctrine, 443. Jewish hostility to the doctrine, 444. | Lebbaeus (see Jude). |
| —, St. Paul the guest of, 413. | Justin Martyr in Palestine, 153. | Lechæum, harbor of, 462. |
| —, the Essene, 172. | Justus, St. Paul meets his followers in the house of, 437. | Legatus, the (see Shēliach). |
| —, the Gaulonite, sect arises under, 199. | | Leprosy, curing of, by Christ, 240. |
| —, whether brother of the Lord, 281, 282. | | Levi, call of (see Matthew). |
| Jude denounces the corruption of the last times, 643. | | —, the publican (see Matthew). |
| —, the apostle, 674. The name as Lebbaeus and Thaddæus, 675. Tradition concerning him, 675. | | —, tribe of 15. |
| | | Levites, chief of the fathers, 14. |
| | | Lidd or Lüdd (see Lydda). |
| | | Light of the World, Christ declares himself the, 203. |
| | | Linus, conversion of, 626. |
| | | Literature and the arts under the Maccabees, 56, 57. |
| | | — of Alexandrine Jews, 147. |
| | | Loaves and Fishes, miracle, first, of the, 271. |
| | | Locusts, food of John the Baptist, controversy about, 199. |
| | | Lola, grandmother of Timothy, 460. |
| | | Longinus, prefect of Syria, 120. |
| | | Lord's Day, sacredness of the, 349, 353. |
| | | —, the first (see Easter Day). |
| | | Love, Law of, as laid down by Christ, 263. |
| | | —, the fulfilling of the Law, 310. |
| | | Lucius of Cyrene, 148. |
| | | Lucullus, 66. |
| | | Luke, St., his sources of information, 230. His account of the Sermon on the Mount, 258, 259. His account of Paul's conversion, 407. His appearance in the company of St. Paul on his second missionary journey, 459. Accompanies him into Macedonia, 465. Left at Philippi, 470. Witness of the latter part of the career of St. Paul down to his imprisonment at Rome, 501. Whether with Titus at Corinth, 575. Shares the imprisonment of Paul at Rome, 585. His last |

K.

Kaisariëh (see Cæsarea).

Kana-el-jell (see Cana).

Karem es Seyad, 249.

Kedron, the brook, 318.

Kefr Kenna (see Cana).

Keys of the kingdom of heaven, the, figure of, 277.

Kahn Minyeh (see Capernaum, site of).

Kibleh, Jerusalem the, of Jewish devotion, 160.

King of the Jews, variations in the title by the Evangelists, 332.

Kingdom of heaven, proclaimed by Christ as at hand, 232.

L.

Lacedæmonians, alliance of the Jews with the, 46.

Lagus, satrap of Egypt, 19.

Lamb of God, Christ as the, 304, 305 (see Christ, Titles of).

Lamentation of Christ over Jerusalem, place of the, 338.

Language of the Jews, 56.

Laodicea, the city of, 602. Christianity introduced into, 602.

Laodicean Epistle, mentioned

| LUKE. | MARK. | MATTHEW. |
|--|---|---|
| <p>relations with St. Paul, 628. His name of Evangelist, 634. Author of the Acts of the Apostles, 637. Outline of his life, 638-690. His connection with St. Paul, 688-690. Second treatise of, 878. Beginning of the Gospel History according to, 178.</p> <p>Luke, Gospel of, parables in the, 285. Concerning the interval in our Lord's life between the Feast of Tabernacles and the Passover, 296. Whether written at Caesarea, 554. Origin of the, 705. Its date and the place where it was written, 706. Purposes for which it was written, 706. Its integrity, 707. Its first two chapters, 707. Its contents, 707. Its genuineness, its relation to the other Gospels, etc (see Gospel).</p> <p>Lycania, intercourse between the churches in, 460. Paul and Barnabas in, 445.</p> <p>Lydda, conversion of the people of, 426.</p> <p>Lydia, conversion of, 406.</p> <p>Lysanias, tetrarch, 115.</p> <p>Lysias, general of Antiochus IV., 28. Guardian of Antiochus V., 36. Advances to Bethesda, 87. Places Antiochus V. on the throne, 33. Put to death, 40.</p> <p>— rescues St. Paul in the Temple court, 542. Places him before the Sanhedrim, 544. Sends him to Felix, 547, 548.</p> <p>Lysimachus, sacrileges of, 25. Killed, 25.</p> <p>Lystra, Paul and Barnabas at, 436. Cure of the cripple at, 446. Site of, 446.</p> | <p>Maccabees, First Book of, 49, 157.</p> <p>—, Second Book of, 157.</p> <p>—, Third Book of, 153.</p> <p>—, Fourth Book of, 153.</p> <p>Macedonia, its contributions for the poor in Jerusalem, 494. Mission of Timothy and Erastus to, 507. Paul in, 521, 522. Paul's collection in, 529. Paul's voyage to, 465. Vision of the man of, 464.</p> <p>Macherus, fortress of, 264.</p> <p>Magadan (see Magdala).</p> <p>Magdala, village of, 269.</p> <p>Magians, the, their worship of Christ, 186.</p> <p>Magnificat, the, 182.</p> <p>Malabar, Christian Church in, 682.</p> <p>Malchias (see Cleodemus).</p> <p>Malchus, king of Arabia, campaign of Herod against, 80.</p> <p>Malchus, courtier of Hyrcanus, 70.</p> <p>Malta, coast of, chart of part of the, 573.</p> <p>—, island of (see Melita).</p> <p>Malthace, fourth wife of Herod the Great, 98.</p> <p>Mamzerim, 696.</p> <p>Manasseh, apostasy of, 16. High-priest, 22.</p> <p>— obtains permission to build a temple on Mount Gerizim for the Samaritans, 141.</p> <p>Mannasses, king of Judah, prayer of, 157.</p> <p>Marcellus, procurator of Judaea, 109.</p> <p>Marcus, Bishop of Jerusalem, 137.</p> <p>Mariamne, daughter of the high-priest Simon, and third wife of Herod, 98.</p> <p>—, wife of Herod, 71, 79, 80. Her death, 82.</p> <p>—, tower of, 86.</p> <p>Mark Antony, 68. Has dominion of the East, 71. Favors Herod, 71, 72. Summons Herod, 79.</p> <p>Mark, St., his sources of information, 230. Explanation of his omission of the Sermon on the Mount, 259. Companion of Paul in his imprisonment at Rome, 585, 586. At Ephesus, 613. His last relations with St. Paul, 619. With Peter at Babylon, 637. His name of Evangelist, 634. Whether he is himself the young man whom he describes as present at the seizure of Christ, 685. His connection with</p> | <p>Paul and Barnabas, 686. His relation to Peter, 680. Beginning of the Gospel history, according to, 178.</p> <p>Mark, St., Gospel of, records the acts rather than the teaching of Christ, 285. Sources of the, 702. Written primarily for Gentiles, 703. Time when it was written, 703. Place where it was written, 704. Its genuineness, 704. Its style and diction and contents, 704, 705. Divisions of, 705. Its genuineness, its relation to the other Gospels, etc (see Gospels).</p> <p>Marriage, Christ's sanction of the ordinance of, 214.</p> <p>Martha, sister of Lazarus, Christ's reply to her, 297.</p> <p>Martyrion, the, built by Constantine, 187.</p> <p>Mary Magdalene, 266, 267. At the burial of Christ, 336. Carries the news of the supposed removal of Christ's body to Peter and John, 349. Christ's appearance to, 351.</p> <p>—, mother of Christ, Gabriel appears to, 180. Visits Elizabeth, 182. Her miraculous conception, 183. Gives birth to the Saviour, 184. Lives with her widowed sister, 191. Genealogy of, 193. At the marriage at Cana, 209. Taken home by John, 336.</p> <p>—, mother of Mark, 686, 686.</p> <p>—, sister of Lazarus, anoints the Lord, 267. At the feet of Jesus, 217.</p> <p>—, sister of Mary the mother of Jesus, 191.</p> <p>—, wife of Clopas, 281. Her sons, 282. At the burial of Christ, 336.</p> <p>Marys, the three, remain by the cross, 323.</p> <p>—, visit of the two, to the sepulchre, 349.</p> <p>Massade, fortress of, 71.</p> <p>Mattathias, the priest, escapes from Jerusalem, 35. Refuses to obey the royal edict, 24. Dies, 35.</p> <p>Matthew, St., his sources of information, 230. Call of, 242. Feast given by, 242. His account of the Sermon on the Mount, 258, 259. The same as Levi the publican, 679. Undertakes to write the Gospel, 634. Beginning of the Gospel history according to, 178.</p> |
| M. | | |
| <p>Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, 137.</p> <p>Maccabean history, authorities for, 53. Line, last king of the, 72.</p> <p>Maccabee, etymology of, 55.</p> <p>Maccabees, authorities for the history of the, 35. Condition of the Jews under the, 31. Struggle of, against Antiochus Epiphanes, 14. Their sacrifice, 52. Their contest, 52, 53. Social and religious progress of Jews under the, 55. Literature under, 53.</p> | | |

| MATTHEW. | NAZARITE. | ONESIPHORUS. |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Matthew, St., Gospel of, parables in the, 285. Language in which it was written, 701. Citations from Old Testament, 701. Genuineness of the first two chapters, 701. Time and place at which it was written, 701. Its purpose, 701, 702. Its contents, 702. Its genuineness, its relation to the other Gospels, etc (see Gospels).</p> <p>Matthias, chosen as an Apostle in place of Judas, 379, 380. Fills the place of Judas Iscariot, 676.</p> <p>—, high-priest, the, deposed, 83.</p> <p>Meckmé, buildings of the, 95.</p> <p>Melita (Malta), island of, its people and its primate Publius, 576, 577. Paul's miracle at, 578.</p> <p>Menelaus obtains the high-priesthood, 24. Sacrilege of, 25. Death, 26.</p> <p>Meroë, in Ethiopia, 398.</p> <p>Messiah, advent of the, announced to Herod, 83, 90. Expectation of the, 101. Jesus announces himself as the, 232.</p> <p>Micah, the prophet, his authority that Bethlehem would be the birthplace of the Messiah, 90.</p> <p>Michmash, fortress of, 43.</p> <p>Miletus, Paul's voyage to, 537.</p> <p>Ministry, Christ's, duration of, 220 (see Duration). Scene of, 220 (see Scene).</p> <p>— of angels to Jesus, 206.</p> <p>Miracle at the "Beautiful" gate, 334. At the gate of Nain, 264. First, of the loaves and fishes, 271. Of healing the man blind from his birth, 293; character of, 294. The man brought before the Council, 294; excommunicated, 294. Of healing the man with the withered hand, 255. Of healing two blind men at Jericho, 300. Of the cure of leprosy, 240, 241. Of the cure of the demoniac, 236-238. Of the cure of the paralytic, 241. Of the finding the piece of money in the fish's mouth, 279. Of the healing of the centurion's servant, 264. Of the healing of the courtier's son, 227, 228. Of the healing of the deaf and dumb, 274. Of the healing of the man possessed by a legion of devils, 265. Of the stilling of the storm,</p> | <p>268. Second, of the loaves and fishes, 274.</p> <p>Miracles already familiar to the Jews, 212. Tests laid down by the Rabbis, 212; satisfied in the miracle at Cana, 212, 213. Effect of the miracle on the disciples, 234. Social aspect of, 214. At the shore of the Galilean lake, 255. Doctrine of, 211. In the evening of the Sabbath at Capernaum, 233. Of St. Paul, 506. Of the Apostles, 387. Performed by Christ at the Passover, 222. The beginning of Christ's, 211. Various examples of Christ's, 243.</p> <p>Mishna, the, 151. Compilation of the, 251.</p> <p>Missionary journey, first, of Paul and Barnabas, 437, 438. The second, of St. Paul, 458. The third, of St. Paul, 503.</p> <p>Mithridates, 66.</p> <p>Mnason, disciple of Cyprus, accompanies St. Paul to Jerusalem, 540.</p> <p>Modin, city of, 34, 59, 60. Monument at, 60.</p> <p>Months, Macedonian names of, supposed to be used by Josephus, 133.</p> <p>Moses, appears in the Transfiguration, 278.</p> <p>Myra, Paul's voyage to, 562, 563.</p> | <p>Nazarites, St. Paul joins four, in their vow, 541.</p> <p>Nein, site of the ancient Nain, 265.</p> <p>Nero, accession of, 496. His decision between Festus and Agrippa and the Jews, 123. Whether he heard Paul's case, 596. His persecution of the Christians, 620. Whether he heard Paul when he was a second time prisoner at Rome, 628.</p> <p>Nerva, accession of, 661.</p> <p>Nethinim, the, 696.</p> <p>Nicanor, commands a Syrian army, 86. Sent to restore Alcimus, 41. Slain, 41.</p> <p>—, one of the seven deacons, 390, 691.</p> <p>Nicetas Choniates, the Byzantine writer, 588.</p> <p>Nicodemus, his relations toward Christ, 222. The secret disciple, in the Council, 291. Brings myrrh and aloes to anoint the body of Christ, 336.</p> <p>Nicolai, origin of name of, 58.</p> <p>Nicolaitans, heresy of the, 625. Sect of the, 692.</p> <p>Nicolas of Damascus, follows Archelaus to Rome, 101. Pleads his cause, 102.</p> <p>—, one of the seven deacons, 390. Not belonging to the sect of Nicolaitans, 692.</p> <p>Nicolaus Damascenus, the rhetorician, 88.</p> <p>Nicopolis, Paul at, 618, 619.</p> <p>Nikón, the ram, 130.</p> <p>Nisibis, Petrine tone, in Christian School, at, 636.</p> <p>Nunc Dimittis, the, 182, 186.</p> <p>Nymphas, saluted in the Epistle to the Colossians, 605.</p> |
| | N. | |
| | <p>Nabathæans, the, 43. Of Arabia Petraea, 65.</p> <p>Nablûs, settlement of Samaritans at, 144.</p> <p>Nahum, the Mede, 145.</p> <p>Nain, miracle at gate of, 264. Site of, 264.</p> <p>Naos (see Temple of Herod).</p> <p>Nasi, president of the Sanhedrim, 73.</p> <p>Nathanael, character of, 262. Is present at Christ's third appearance to the Apostles, 354. (See Bartholomew).</p> <p>Nativity, Star of the, appearance of the, announced to Herod, 82.</p> <p>Nazarenes, origin of the name, 189.</p> <p>Nazareth, account of, 196. Under opprobrium, 196. Christ brought to, 180. Christ's rejection at, 226, 232. Christ's second rejection at, 263.</p> <p>Nazarite, John the Baptist, a, 182, 183.</p> | <p>O.</p> <p>Octavian, his favor toward Herod, 81.</p> <p>Offense, Mount of, 339.</p> <p>Olives, Mount of, Christ and the disciples go out to the, 318. Account of the, 337-341. Sacred house erected on the, by the Empress Helena, 339.</p> <p>Olivet (see Olives).</p> <p>Olympic Games, Herod made president of, 84.</p> <p>Onesimus, his relation to Philemon, 590, 591. His mission to the Colossians and Ephesians, 592.</p> <p>Onesiphorus, ministers to Paul in the last stage of his course, 624.</p> |

ONIAS.

Onias, stoned to death, 65.
 — I., high-priest, 19.
 — II., high-priest, 22.
 — III., high-priest, 23. De-
 posed, 24. Put to death, 25.
 — IV., heir to high-priest-
 hood, tries to revive Jewish
 worship in Egypt, 40.
 Onkelos, 152.
 Ophel, suburb of, burned, 184.
 Wall of, 94, 95.
 Oral Law, belief of the Phar-
 isees in an, 165.
 Ordination, ceremony of,
 adopted by the Christian
 Church from the Jewish,
 438.
 Orodes, Arabian king, defeats
 Alexander Jannæus, 64.
 Otiosi (see Batlanium).

P.

Palace of Herod, 85.
 Pacorus, the Parthian, 71.
 Palestine, division of, at the
 time of Christ, 252. Gov-
 erned by Laomedon, 19.
 By Ptolemy, 19. Subject to
 the first five Ptolemies, 19.
 The dowry of Cleopatra, 23.
 Pallas, brother of Felix, 122.
 Palm Sunday, 304.
 Pangæus, gold mines of, 465.
 Clans of, 466.
 Panium, temple at, 84.
 Paphos, Barnabas and Saul at,
 438. Situation of, 439.
 Pappus, general of Antigonus,
 72.
 Parable, meaning of the word,
 283.
 — of the faithful and un-
 faithful servant, 312.
 — of the foolish virgins,
 312.
 Parables ascribed to Hillel,
 Shammai, and other great
 rabbis, 284.
 —, Christ's, 268.
 — concerning the rejection
 of Christ by the Pharisees,
 308.
 — of Christ, 283-285. Their
 number, 285. List of the,
 285. Interpretation of the,
 286.
 Paraclete, the, 318.
 Paralytic, cure of the, 241.
 Parmenas, one of the seven
 deacons, 390, 621.
 Parmenio, 16.
 Parthians, overthrow of Cras-
 sus by the, 69.
 —, the, assist Syria, 71.
 Paschal Lamb, the, selected,
 304. Time appointed for
 killing the, 314.

PAUL.

Paschal Week, first day of the,
 304. Second day of the, 306.
 Third day of the, last day
 of our Lord's public teach-
 ing, 307-311. Fourth day
 of the, 313. Fifth day of
 the, when the Passover must
 be killed, 314. Evening and
 night of the, 316.
 "Passion Week," the, 303.
 Passover, approach of the,
 after Christ's short abode at
 Capernaum, 215. Christ at-
 tends the, 189. Feast of the,
 exact time of its commence-
 ment, 314. Christ's appear-
 ance at, 219, 220. Second,
 of Christ's ministry (see
 Feast of the Jews). The
 Third, during our Lord's
 ministry, 271. What the
 sign of, 315.
 —, (see Supper, Paschal).
 Passovers, mentioned by St.
 John, 219. The, during our
 Lord's ministry, 249, 250.
 Pastoral Epistles, their testi-
 mony to St. Paul's freedom
 after two years' imprison-
 ment at Rome, 596. Their
 general indications, 608, 609.
 Difficulties of detail, 610.
 Scheme of Mr. Lewin, 610.
 Patmos, aspect of, 558. St.
 John banished to, 559. Tra-
 ditional scene of the Revela-
 tion, 559.
 Paul, St., special revelation to,
 261. Chosen as the apostle
 of the Greeks, 382. Outline
 of his life, 403, 404. His first
 appearance as a persecutor,
 403. Review of his former
 life, 404. His birthplace and
 parentage, 404. His Roman
 citizenship, 404. His trade
 of tent-making, 405. His
 education in Greek learning
 at Tarsus, 405, and in rab-
 binical lore at Jerusalem,
 405. His rigid Pharisaism
 and zeal for the Law, 406.
 His persecuting spirit in its
 relation to the teaching of
 Gamaliel, 407. Confessions
 of his own state of mind, 407,
 408. His part in the mar-
 tyrdom of Stephen and the
 ensuing persecutions, 408.
 The three accounts of his
 conversion, 409. Scene of
 the, 410. The *light*, and
 Paul's vision of Jesus, 410.
 The *sound*, and Paul's col-
 loquy with the Lord, 411.
 The outward and inward
 aspects of the scene, 411, 412.
 Before Agrippa, 411. His
 return to Damascus, 413.

PAUL.

The mission of Ananias to
 him, 413. Restored to sight
 and baptized, 414. His con-
 version an evidence of the
 truth of Christianity, 414,
 415. His designation to the
 apostleship, 415. His min-
 istry at Damascus and re-
 tirement into Arabia, 415,
 416. His escape from Da-
 mascus to Jerusalem, 416.
 His reception by the Apos-
 tles and the Church, 417.
 Disputes with the Hellenists,
 417. His relations to Peter,
 417, 418. His vision in the
 Temple and full commission
 to the Gentiles, 418. Chro-
 nology of his life, 419-423.
 His ministry in Syria and
 Cilicia, 432. With Barnabas
 at Antioch, 432. Whether
 at Jerusalem at the time of
 the deliverance of Peter from
 prison, 433. His mission to
 Jerusalem (his second visit),
 433. His rapture and in-
 firmity, 434, 435. His sepa-
 ration with Barnabas for the
 mission to the Gentiles, 436.
 One of the Apostles, 437.
 His first missionary journey
 with Barnabas, 437, 438.
 They preach in the Jewish
 synagogue, 438. Conver-
 sion of Sergius Paulus and
 judgment on Elymas, 439.
 Precedence of Paul over Bar-
 nabas, 440. The name of,
 440. Passage of the Taurus,
 440, 441. At Antioch in
 Pisidia, 441, 442. His dis-
 course there in the syna-
 gogue, 442, 443. Persecuted
 by the Jews, 444. With Bar-
 nabas at Iconium, 446. Suc-
 cess and persecution there,
 446. Cure of the cripple at
 Lystra, 446. Stoned, 447.
 His return journey with Bar-
 nabas, 447. Considered by
 the people at Lystra to be
 Mercury, 446. His first dis-
 course to mere heathens,
 446. He and Barnabas go
 to Jerusalem to oppose the
 Judaizing spirit in the
 Church, 448. Comparison
 of this visit with that in Gal.
 ii., 449. "Goes up by rev-
 elation," 450. Conferences
 and compacts with the other
 Apostles, James, Peter and
 John, 450. His report with
 that of Barnabas, 452. His
 reproof of Peter, 455. Re-
 turns with Barnabas to An-
 tioch, 456. His second mis-
 sionary journey, 458. Ac-

PAUL.

accompanied by Silas, 459. Their visit to Syria, Cilicia, and Lycaonia, 459, 460. Is accompanied by Timothy on his journey, 461. In Phrygia and Galatia, 462. Forbidden to preach the Gospel in Asia, 463. His call into Europe, 464. His illness, 465. His voyage to Macedonia, 465. At Neapolis, 465. At Philippi, 465-467. Conversion of Lydia, 466. Healing of the possessed damsel, 467. Scourged and imprisoned with Silas, 468. Conversion of the jailer after the earthquake, 469. Proclaims his Roman citizenship, 470. His release, 469. Arrives with Silas at Thessalonica, 471. Preaches in the synagogue and rouses the envy of the Jews, 471. Leaves Thessalonica, 471. His teaching there, 472. At Berea, 473. Sails to Athens, 474. His emotions at the sight of the city, 475. His discourses in the Agora, 475. Encountered by the Stoics and Epicureans, 475, 476. His discourse at the Areopagus, 476-479. His revelation of the Unknown God, 478, 479. His rebuke of idolatry and preaching of repentance and judgment by Him whom God had raised, 480. Interruption of his discourse, 480. His departure from Athens, 481. His converts at Athens, 480. Lives at Corinth with Aquila and Priscilla, working with his own hands, 483. His reasons for this course, 484, 485. "Constrained by the Word," 486. His plain proclamation of Christ crucified, 487. Rejected by the Jews, he turns to the Gentiles, 487. God visits him by a vision in the night, 488. His autograph salutation, to prove his letters genuine, and to add emphasis to truth, 489, 490. Brought before Gallio, 491. Tumult of the Jews against, 490, 491. His vow at Cenchreae, 492. His voyage to Ephesus and visit to the synagogue, 493. Goes to Jerusalem, 493. Connection of this visit with his future work, 494. His contest with Judaizing teachers, and refusal of Jewish Christians, 494. Returns to Antioch,

PAUL.

494. End of his second missionary journey, 495. The visit of Galatians II., 495, 496. Extent and duration of his third missionary journey, 500. His constant conflict with the Judaizers, 501, 502. Its commencement in the churches of Galatia, 502. His Epistle to the Galatians refuting the Judaizing heresy, 502. His dealing with the twelve disciples who knew only the baptism of John, 504. Preaches in the synagogue at Ephesus, 504. His rejection and withdrawal, 505. Preaches in the school of Tyrannus, 506. His miracles, 506. His conflict with the magical arts, 506. Prepares to leave Ephesus, 507. Change in his plan owing to news from Corinth, 508, 509. His first Epistle to the Corinthians, 509, 510. Its date and place, 512. His relations with Apollos, 513. Question of a former Epistle and of an intermediate visit to Corinth, 513. Contents and spirit of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, 516-518. Sequel of his stay at Ephesus, 519, 520. Sets out for Macedonia, 521. His labors at Troas, 522. His disappointment at not meeting Titus there, 520. Goes to Philippi and meets Titus, 522. His Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 523. Its relation to the missions of Timothy and Titus, 523. Question of an intermediate epistle, 524. Character and contents of the Second Epistle, 525-530. Opposition to him in the Corinthian church, 527. His labors in Macedonia and Illyricum, 530. His arrival at Corinth, 530. His epistle to the Romans, 530-536. His views toward the West, 531. His journey through Macedonia and voyage from Philippi after the Passover, 536. His week at Troas and farewell Sunday, 536. Restores Eutychus to life, 537. His voyage to Miletus, 537. His discourse to the Ephesian elders, 537. His voyage to Patara and then to Phoenicia, 538. His week at Tyre, and another Sunday farewell, 538, 539. Takes

PAUL.

up his abode at Caesarea with Philip the deacon, 539. His journey to Jerusalem, 540. His reception by the churches, 538. Dangers from the Judaizers, 540. Joins four Nazarites in their vow, 541. Assaulted in the Temple and rescued by the tribune Lysias, 542. His defenses to the people and before the Sanhedrin, 543-547. The plot against his life, 548. Sent to Caesarea, 548. His defense before Felix and imprisonment at Caesarea, 549, 551. Results of his imprisonment, 553. His hearing before Festus, 554. Appeals to Caesar, 555. His defense before Agrippa, 557-559. The decision to send him to Rome, 559. His voyage and shipwreck, minute truthfulness of the narrative of, 560. Embarks under the charge of Julius, 561. Lands at Sidon, 562. His voyage to Myra and change of ship, 562. From Cnidus into the open sea, under the lee of Crete, 563. Arrival at Fair Havens, 563. His unheeded warning, 563. Ship caught in a typhoon, 564. Preparations against the storm, 565, 566. Undergirding the ship, 565. The ship drifts on the starboard tack, 566. Her course and rate, 567. Sufferings during the drift, 567. Vision in the night, 570. Promise of escape, 570. Signs of land, 571. Paul's last encouragement, 572. Position of the ship in St. Paul's Bay, 574. The shipwreck and escape, 575. Paul's former shipwrecks, 576. His use of nautical images, 576. His stay at Malta, 576-578. Voyage to Syracuse, Rhegium, and Puteoli, 578. Journey by land to Rome, 580. Met by Christians at Appii Forum and the Three Taverns, 580. Delivered to Burrus, 580. His condition as a prisoner in the Prætorium, 581. His two conferences with the Jews, 582. Preaches to the Gentiles, 582. His two years' imprisonment at Rome and cause for the delay of his trial, 584. His labors and converts, 584, 585. His Epistles written at Rome, 584. His severe suffering in his

PAUL.

imprisonment, 587. His Epistle to the Colossians, 587-591. His Epistle to Philemon, 590. His teaching concerning slavery, 591. His Epistle to the Ephesians, 593. His Epistle to the Philippians, 598, 594. His prospects at this time, 594, 595. His probable acquittal and release, 596. The relation of the Epistle to the Hebrews to his first imprisonment at Rome, 597-601. Purposed visit to Jerusalem, 601. His movements after leaving Rome, 609. Sails for Jerusalem, 610. Visits Colossae and Ephesus, 610, 611. His labors at Ephesus, 611. His Epistles to Timothy and Titus, 610-618. Visits Corinth and winters at Nicopolis, 618. Further movements of, 621. Tradition of his journey to Spain, 622, 623. The last stage of his course, 623. Probably arrested at Ephesus, 624. Indications of his route to Rome as a prisoner, 626. Treated as a felon, 623. His first hearing and deliverance from the lion, 627, 628. His loneliness, 628. Motives of the urgent invitation to Timothy, 629. His prospects of martyrdom, 629. Beheaded, 631. Discussion of the date, 631, 632. His personal appearance and character, 633. Early attacks on him, 634. Authorities for the life of, 638. Conversion of (*see* Saul of Tarsus). Harmony of Peter and, 637-639. Epistles of, comparison of them with the Acts, 402. Versatility of the Apostle's mind shown in the, 430. The Fourteen Epistles of, their order, 711. Paul's, St., Bay, 574. Pella, becomes the seat of the "Church of Jerusalem," 123. The seat of the Church of Jerusalem for a time, 648. Pentateuch, allegoric exposition of the, by Aristobulus, 147. Described by Aristobulus as the source of Greek philosophy, 147. The, when translated, 152. The Samaritan, 153. Origin of, 155. Pentecost, the Day of, 331-383. 3000 converts on, 383. Peter, final call of, 285. Heal-

PETER.

ing of his wife's mother, 238. The faith of, 261. Attempts to walk upon the water, 272. His confession, 273. His full confession of the Christ, 276, 277. Controversy about his position in the Church, 277. His remonstrance when Christ reveals the mystery of his death and resurrection, 277. Released by a miracle from his difficulty about the tribute-money, 279. Sent to prepare the last supper, 315. His presence at it, 316. Christ's prediction concerning his denial of him, 317. Charged by Christ to watch in the garden, 318, 319. Rebuked by Christ when he cuts off the ear of the high-priest's servant, 320. Remains when the other disciples flee, 320. His denial of Christ, 321. His visit to the sepulchre, 350. Christ's appearance to him, 352. His avowal of love to Christ, 354. Christ's command to him and prediction of his martyrdom, 354. One of the "pillars" of the Church, 355. His office in the Church, 380. His sermon on the Day of Pentecost, 283. His second discourse, 345. His healing the lame man, 334. With John before the Sanhedrim, 365. Proclaims the deceit of Ananias and Sapphira, 386. His boldness at his second appearance before the Sanhedrim, 337. He and John confer on the converted Samaritans the gift of the Holy Ghost, 397. His relations to St. Paul, 416, 417. His mission to the Gentiles, 418. He heals Aeneas and converts the people of Lydda, 426. Raises Dorcas and makes converts at Joppa, 427. His mission to Cornelius, 428. Receives the first Gentile converts into the Church, 428. Nature of this transaction, 429. His deliverance from prison, 431, 432. At the conferences at Jerusalem about the Judaizing spirit in the Church, 451. Speech of, in the Church at Jerusalem, 451-453. His subsequent reproof by St. Paul, 455. Whether at Corinth, 528. His association with John, 658. Associated

PHARISES.

by tradition with St. Paul in martyrdom, 634. Review of his life, 634. His last appearance in the Acts, 635. His probable occupation, 635. His first Epistle written from Babylon, 636. His intercourse with Paul, 637. Designed harmony of the Epistle with Paul's teaching, 638. Pauline style of the Epistle accounted for, 639. Discussion of the tradition of St. Peter's episcopate at Rome, 640-642. His own testimony to the true Rock and spiritual Stones of the Church, 642. Peter, First Epistle of, its authenticity, 715. —, Second Epistle of, its authenticity, 715. Persea, Christ's progress through, 199. Extent of, under Herod, 81. Reduced by the Romans, 127. Perga in Pamphylia, the voyage of Paul and Barnabas to, 440, 441. Paul and Barnabas at, 447. Persian dominion, 14. Petilius Cerealis, Samaritans surrender to, 127. Petronius P., prefect of Syria, 100, 114. Pharisees and chief priests set a watch over the tomb of Christ, 337. — and Sadducees, alliance between the, 275. Jealousy between, 388. Their difference sunk in common hatred against the Christians, 408. — and Herodians, the, seek to entrap Christ, 308. —, the, 31. Under John Hyrcanus and his successors, 51, 52. Their power on the death of Alexander Jannæus, 64. Defeated by Aristobulus II., 65. Under Herod, 84. At the time of Herod, 91. Their union with the Herodians, 93. Name and origin of, 165. Doctrines of, 165. Their belief in an oral Law, 165. Their laws and regulations, 166, 167. Their belief in a future state, 168. Their spirit of proselytism, 168. Denounced by John the Baptist, 201. Reject him, 201. Prepare to attack Jesus, 224. Come to watch Jesus, 241. Charge the disciples with Sabbath-breaking, 253, 254. Plot with the Herodians against Christ, 255. Christ's con-

| PHASAËL. | POMPEY. | PUDENS. |
|---|--|--|
| <p>trovery with, when they charge him with casting out devils by the power of Beelzebub, 208. Christ's encounter with, who ask for a sign, 275. Leaven of the, 276. Christ's controversy with the, 292. The blind man healed by Jesus brought before them, 294. Their blindness in sin, 295. Hold a council concerning Jesus, 298. Christ's rebuke of the, when they question his authority, 308. Their share in resisting Christianity, 391. Working among them of the conviction of the truth of Christ's Messiahship, 407. St. Paul's appeal to the, 547.</p> <p>Phasaël, son of Antipater, made governor of Jerusalem, 69. Puts down revolt of Jews at Jerusalem, 70. Made tetrarch, 71. Death of, 71.</p> <p>Phasëlus, tower of, 86.</p> <p>Phenice (see Phoenix).</p> <p>Pheroras, son of Antipater, 69. Government entrusted to him by Herod, 80. Tetrarchy of, 87. Conspires against Herod's life, 89. His death, 89.</p> <p>Philemon, character of, 590. Epistle to, written at Rome, 590. Its teaching concerning slavery, 591.</p> <p>Philetus, leader of a sect, 612. Teaches that "the resurrection is passed already," 614. St. Paul's mention of, 617.</p> <p>Philip, call of, 209. His confession of Christ, 209. Affection of, 261. One of the seven deacons, 390. Also called "Philip the Evangelist," 390. His conversion of the Samaritans, 397; of the Ethiopian eunuch, 397, 398. His mission to the cities of the Philistine plain, 398. Fixes his abode at Casarea, 398. His daughters, 398. Paul takes up his abode with, 539. His daughters prophesy, 539, 591.</p> <p>—, the Apostle, 676. His connection with Andrew, 677, 678. His desire to see the Father, 678. As deacon and evangelist, 691.</p> <p>—, governor of Jerusalem, 26. Claims the guardianship of Antiochus V., 39.</p> <p>— V., of Macedon, his league with Antiochus, 23.</p> | <p>Phillip, son of Herod and Cleopatra, tetrarch of Iturea, 98.</p> <p>Philippi, after the Passover, 536. Battle of, 70. Christians at, minister to the wants of Paul at Rome, 585. Conversion of the jailer at, 469. Jewish oratory at, 465, 466. Paul at, 465-470. Paul meets Titus at, 522. Paul's voyage from, 536. The earthquake at, 468.</p> <p>Philippians, Church of the, 470. Epistle to the, 593. Written at Rome, 586.</p> <p>Philistine country, overrun by Judas Maccabeus, 89.</p> <p>Philo, writings of, 111-113.</p> <p>Philocrates, letter addressed to, giving an account of the origin of the Septuagint, 152.</p> <p>Phocylides, poem of, 147.</p> <p>Phoebe, deaconess of the Church at Cenchrea, 493. Carries St. Paul's Epistle to Rome, 586.</p> <p>Phoenicia, sufferings of, by the wars of the successors of Alexander, 20.</p> <p>Phoenix, port of, 564.</p> <p>Phrygia, journey of Paul through, 462.</p> <p>Phygellus, desertion of the Asiatic Christians led by, 624.</p> <p>Pilate, his connection with Antipater, 81.</p> <p>—, Pontius, Jesus brought before, 324. Sends him to Herod Antipas, 325. Appeals to the generosity of the people, 325. Yields up Jesus, 326. Makes one more effort to save him, 326, 327. His final sentence, 327. Writes the title of Christ to mortify the Jews, 331. His care to ascertain the truth of Christ's death, 336. Allows Joseph to take Christ's body, 336. (See Pilatus.)</p> <p>Pilatus, Pontius, procurator of Judaea, 107. His descent, 107. Origin of name of, 108. Riots in his time, 108. Recalled to Rome, 109. Banished, 109.</p> <p>Pisidia, St. Paul directs his course to, 440.</p> <p>Polemon, king of Pontus, 118.</p> <p>Politarcha, Jason before the, 471.</p> <p>Pollio, spared by Herod, 78.</p> <p>Pompey, 66. Appears at Damascus, 66. Enters Jerusalem, 67, 68.</p> | <p>Poor, condition of the, in the Primitive Church, 365.</p> <p>Poppæa, Nero's mistress, 584. Married to Nero, 595.</p> <p>Portitores (see Publicana).</p> <p>Posca (see Acetum).</p> <p>Posidonium, the, 482.</p> <p>Pozzuoli (see Puteoli).</p> <p>Prætorian Camp at Rome, the, 581.</p> <p>Prætorium, Jesus led to the, 324. Paul, a prisoner in the, 580, 581.</p> <p>Prayer, in the Primitive Church, 384. And fasting, power of, 279.</p> <p>Precipitation, scene of the, attempted, 197.</p> <p>Presbyter (see Elder).</p> <p>Priest (see Elder).</p> <p>Priests, Chief, and Scribes, demand of Christ the authority by which he had acted, 306.</p> <p>Priscilla (see Aquila).</p> <p>Prochorus, one of the seven deacons, 390, 691.</p> <p>Procurator, description of office of a, 106.</p> <p>Proselytes of Righteousness, 150.</p> <p>— of the Covenant (see Proselytes of Righteousness).</p> <p>— of the Gate, 149, 399.</p> <p>—, the, 148-150.</p> <p>Proseuchæ, the, statues of Caligula set up in, 111.</p> <p>—, the, 159.</p> <p>Protomartyr of the Christian Church, Stephen, the, 391.</p> <p>Psammethichus, Egyptian king, 398.</p> <p>Psephinus, tower of, 86.</p> <p>Ptolemy II., Philadelphus, Septuagint ascribed partly to literary tastes of, 21.</p> <p>— III., Euergetes, Onias II. refuses to pay tribute to, 22.</p> <p>— IV., Philopator, his war with Antiochus the Great, 22. His persecution of the Jews, 23.</p> <p>— V., Epiphanes, marries Cleopatra, 23.</p> <p>— VI., Philometor, 25.</p> <p>— Lathyrus, ravages Judæa, 63.</p> <p>— Macron, governor of Coele Syria, 36.</p> <p>—, son of Abubus, 49.</p> <p>— takes Jerusalem, 19.</p> <p>Publicans (portitores), oppression of the, 199. Their belief in John the Baptist, 201. The, account of, 215, 216.</p> <p>Publius, the primate of Melita, 577, 578.</p> <p>Pudens, conversion of, 636.</p> |

| PUTEOLI. | SABINUS. | SAMARIA. |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Supposed British origin of, 627.
 Puteoli, Paul's voyage to, 578.
 Jewish residents at, 580.
 Christians at, 590.</p> | <p>Rockman, title of the, 666.
 Roman Church, Judaism in the, 533. Gentile element in the, 533.
 Roman influence in the temple of Herod, 84.
 Romans drawn toward Judaism and afterward toward Christianity, 148, 149. Their feelings toward the Jews under Caligula, 112, 113. Epistle to the, 530-535. Relation of the Epistle to the constitution of the Roman Church, 533. Its mixed Jewish and Gentile character, 533. The strong Greek element, 533. Spirit and contents of the Epistle, 534-536.</p> | <p>marches to Jerusalem after the death of Herod, 101. His exactions, 101, 102. Sadduc (see Zadok). Sadducees, founded by Zadok, 20.</p> |
| <p>Q.
 Quadratus, Ummidius, prefect of Syria, 551.
 Quirinus, prefect of Syria, 106.</p> | <p>Rome, Christianity at, 456. Evidence of St. Peter's visit to and crucifixion at, 641. St. Peter not the founder of the Church of, 642. First appearance of name of, in Jewish history, 41. Intervention of, between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, 66. Jewish alliance with, 46. Jewish settlements in, 148. League of, with the Jews, 41. Paul's arrival at, 580. His two years' imprisonment at, 584. Progress of the Gospel at, during Paul's imprisonment, 585. The burning of, 619. Persecution of Christians at, by Nero, 620. War of, against the Jews, 126.</p> | <p>—, the, 31. Under John Hyrcanus and his successors, 51. Their union with the Herodians, 93. Name and origin of, 168, 169. Their doctrines, 170. Denial of an oral law, 170. Denial of a resurrection of the dead, 170. Denial of angels, 170. Belief in the freedom of the will, 170. Supposed rejection of all Scripture except the Pentateuch, 171. Their disappearance, 171. Denounced by John the Baptist, 201. Christ's encounter with the, who ask for a sign, 275. The leaven of the, 275. Attempt of the, to entrap Christ, 308. Seize Peter and John, and carry them to prison, 384. Throw all the Apostles into prison, 387. And Pharisees, jealousy between, 388. At first take the lead in resisting Christianity, 391.</p> |
| <p>R.
 Rab, rabbi, rabban, 175.
 "Rabban," title of, 388.
 Rabbi of the synagogue, 161.
 Ragaba, siege of, 64.
 Raphia, battle of, 22.
 Redemption, the beginning of the Covenant of, 179.
 Repentance, doctrine of, preached by John, 231.
 Resurrection and the Life, Christ proclaims that he is the, when he raises Lazarus from the dead, 398. Christ's answer to the Sadducees concerning the, 302. Christ's prophecy of his, 221. Christ's, to be the great sign, 275. Denial of the, heresy, of the, 617. Influence of the doctrine on the Jews after the capture of Jerusalem, 171. Jewish belief in the, 39. Of Christ, chief mission of the Apostles to bear witness to the, 260. Time of the, 348, 349.
 —, of the dead, denial of, by the Sadducees, 170. The account of, by St. Matthew, 3.8. Controversy between Paul and his accusers turned upon, 547, 555.
 Revelation of St. John, the, meaning of the word, 719. Its canonical authority and authorship, 719, 720. Time and place at which it was written, 720. Its contents, 720-722. Its interpretation, 723. Divisions of its expositors into Historical, Præterist, and Futurist, 723, 724.
 Rhamnus, the, 827.
 Rhegium, Paul's voyage to, 578.
 Robes of the high-priest, Jews again permitted to have custody of, 109. Romans attempt to regain possession of, 120.
 Rock, Christ as the, 377.</p> | <p>"Rosetta Stone," 24.
 Rufus, son of Simon, 329.</p> | <p>Salamis in Cyprus, Barnabas and Saul sail for, 488. Situation of, 489.
 Salmone, headland of Crete, 563.
 Salmonetta, Paul's ship anchors off, 574.
 Salome, daughter of Antipater, 79. Accuses Mariamne, 80, 82. Prejudices Herod against his sons, 87. Provided for by her brother Herod's will, 99. Follows Archelaus to Rome, 101. Pleads the cause of Antipas, 101.</p> |
| <p>H H 2</p> | <p>S.
 Sabbath after the Crucifixion, preparation for the, 329. Grief of the disciples on the, 337. Christ asserts his supremacy over the, 245, 246. Christ heals the man blind from his birth on the, 294. Healing of the man with the withered hand on the, 255. Plucking of the ears of corn on the, 253, 254.
 —, New, institution of the, 315.
 " Sabbath, the second-first," question concerning the phrase, 254.
 Sabinus, procurator of Judæa, 106.
 —, procurator of Syria.</p> | <p>—, wife of Herod Philip II., 105.
 —, daughter of Herodias, dances before the king, 265. Demands the head of John the Baptist, 265.
 —, her qualities transmitted to her son John, 656.
 Samaria, Christ's journey through and rejection in, 280. City of, destroyed, 50. Description of, by Josephus, 144. Destroyed by Alexander, 142. Destruction of, 17. Extent of, under Herod, 81. Overrun by Judas Maccabeus, 39. Restoration of, by Herod, 58. Success of Christ's ministry in, 243. The woman of, 142.</p> |


| SAMARITAN. | SICARIL | SIMON. |
|--|---|--|
| Samaritan woman, the, at Jacob's well, 225. | Scribes, the, 173-176. | Jerusalem, at the time of Cestius Gallus, 125. Their murder of Ananias, 546. |
| Samaritans, rebellion of, 17. | " —, words of the," 174. | Sidon, Paul at, 562. |
| Persecuted by Antiochus IV., 26, 27. Excluded from the Temple, 107. On the return from the Captivity, 140-144. Their origin, 140, 141. Their character, 141. Their opposition to the Jews, 141. Their observance of the Law, 142. Their claim to partake of Jewish blood, 142. Christ's words confirmatory of the view that they were not Jews, 143. Their state at the time of Christ, 143. Converted by Philip, 390, 396. Peter and John preach to the, 397. Cuthæan, the, 143, 144. | Sebaste (see Samaria.) | Sidonians, revolt of, 15. |
| Sameas, spared by Herod, 70, 78. | Secta, Jewish, origin and name of the, 164. Three chief, 165. | Silas, sent to Antioch, 456. |
| Sampsigeranus, king of Emesa, 118. | Secundus of the Thessalonians, goes to Troas, 531. | Accompanies St. Paul on his second missionary journey, 459. Left at Beroea, 474. Rejoins Paul at Corinth, 481, 485. His arrival gives a new impulse to St. Paul, 486. His aid owned by Paul, 487. The associate of Peter, 500. With Paul at Philippi (see Paul). |
| Sanhedrim, Alexandrian, chiefs of the, summoned before Flaccus, 111. Herod cited to appear before the, 70. Jesus arraigned before the, 322. Paul before the, 544, 545. Peter and John before the, 385. Stephen before the, 391-393. Apostles before the, 387. The, origin of, 73, 74. The, taken to Jabneh, 251. Removed to Sepphoris, 251. Afterward to Tiberias, 251. The, whether possessing the power of inflicting death at the time of St. Stephen's martyrdom, 393. | Seleucia, the port of Antioch, 437, 438. | Silo, general, treachery of, 72. |
| " —, Great," 73. | Seleucidæ, kingdom of the, reaches climax of its power, 22. | Siloam, pool of, 293. |
| Sapha, Alexander and Jaddua at, 16. | Seleucus Nicator, founder of Antioch in Pisidia, 442. Transplants Jews from Babylonia, 145. | Silvanus, with Peter at Babylon, 637. His influence, 639. |
| Sapphira (see Ananias). | — IV., Philopator, succeeds his father, 23. | Silwân (see Siloam). |
| "Satan, delivering to," 652. | Senate of elders, convened with the Sanhedrim to judge the Apostles, 387. | — Birket (see Siloam). |
| Satan's temptation of Christ, 204-207. | Seneca, decline of his influence, 595. | Simeon, surnamed Niger, 143. |
| Saturninus, Roman governor of Syria, 88. | Sentius Saturninus, governor of Syria at the time of the birth of Christ, 195. | Proclaims Jesus as the Christ of God, 185. His prophecy, 186. Song of, 186. |
| Saul of Tarsus, his share in the martyrdom of Stephen, 393. His conversion, 394. Date of, 396. His previous persecution of the Church, 396. | Septuagint, the, 21. Origin of, 152. Its estimation by the Hellenistic Jews, 152. Its wide dispersion, 153. Its influence in the spread of the Gospel, 153. | Simon, a Cyrenian, said to have been the bearer of the cross of Christ, 329. |
| Scaurus, lieutenant of Pompey, 66. | Septuagint translation, effect of the, 146. | — Bar-Gioras, 126. Heads a party at Jerusalem, 128. His defense of Jerusalem, 129-132. His flight, 131. |
| Scene of our Lord's ministry, 243, 247. | Sepulchre of Christ, the, 336. The watch and seal upon the, 337. | — Bar-Jonah, his friendship with St. John, 657. |
| Scæva of Ephesus, 162. Sons of, their exorcism defeated, 506. | Sepulchre, holy, site of the, 345. Visit of the women to the, 349. Visit of Peter and John to the, 350. | —, coins of, 57. |
| Scopas, Jews ill-treated by, 23. | Serapeum, library deposited in the, 146. | —, high-priest under Herod, 85. |
| Scourging before Crucifixion, 344. | Serapis, worship of, 146. | — IL, high-priest, 22. |
| | Sergius Paulus, conversion of, 439. | —, made high-priest, 115. |
| | Sermon on the Mount, date of the, according to St. Matthew, 241. Preliminary questions concerning the, 256. Time and scene of, 269. Precepts of, 262. Effect of the discourse, 264. | — Magus, the magician, 397. His baptism, 397. Offers money to the Apostles, 397. History of, 399-400. His attempt to combine Christianity with Gnosticism, 397, 400. |
| | Seron defeated by Judas Maccabæus, 37. | —, son of Mattathias, 38. |
| | Severus, Julius, his command of the army in Judæa, 135. | Sent into Galilee, 38. Aids his brother Jonathan, 43. Routs the Syrians, 45. Made leader when Jonathan was taken prisoner, 46. Becomes high-priest, 46. Memorial of his services, 47. Slain, 49. |
| | Shammai, school of, 175. | —, surnamed Peter, brought by Andrew to Jesus, 208. |
| | Sharon, the plain of, 426. | — I., the Just, high-priest, 20. Saying ascribed to, 173. |
| | Shechem or Sychar, 144. The oak of, 142. | — the leper, the supper in the house of, 300. |
| | Shêllach, office of the, 161. | — the Pharisee, Christ in the house of, 266. |
| | Shemaiah, Jewish rabbi, 79. | — the tanner, St. Peter's abode in the house of, 427. |
| | Shepherd, Good, parable of the, 295. | —, the treasurer of the Temple, 23, 24. |
| | Shepherds of the Christian Church, 162. | — the Zealot, or the Co |
| | Sicarii, appearance of the, 121. Assist the insurgents at | |

| SIMON. | TEMPLE. | THOMAS. |
|--|---|--|
| naanite, 675. Identity of the epithets, 675. | Synagogue, the Great, men of, 173. Simon, last survivor of, 20. | 190. Jews attempt to rebuild the, under Hadrian, 135. Of Solomon, Apostles assemble daily in the portico of the, 387. Polluted by Samaritans, 107. Restored by Herod, 85, 86. Still the centre of Judaism after the Dispersion, 145. |
| Simon, whether brother of the Lord, 281, 282. | Synagogues, Christ teaches in the, 232. History of the, 151, 160. Their influence, 150. Structure, 160. Internal arrangement, 160, 161. Officers of, 161, 162. Worship, 162, 163. Judicial functions, 163, 164. Remains of, in Galilee, 251. | Temple of Herod, 84, 95. |
| Soëmus, officer of Herod, 80. | Syracuse, Paul's voyage to, 578. | —, Jewish, built in Egypt, by Onias, 40. Site of, 40. |
| Solomon, the Wisdom of, book of, 156. | Syria, governors of, list of, 139. Kings of the Greek kingdom of, table of, 32. Multitudes drawn by the fame of Christ's teaching and miracles from, 239. Paul and Silas visit, 450. Relations of, toward Egypt at the time of Ptolemy VI., 25. Under Cassius, 70. Revolt of, 71. | — on Mount Gerizim, seized by Athenæus, and dedicated to Zeus Xenius, 27. Rebuilt by Herod, 86. |
| Son of Man, the coming of the, 646. | Syrian provinces, Jews of the, 145. | Temptation of Christ, the, 203-206. Scene of, 204. |
| Sopater of Beroea, goes to Troas, 536. | Syrians, defeated by Judas Maccabæus, 36. | Terentius Rufus left at Jerusalem to carry out the work of demolition, 184. |
| —, son of Pyrrhus, 475. | Syro-Phœnician woman, prayer of the, 274. | Tertullus comes to Cæsarea, to accuse Paul before Felix, 540. |
| Sosius, 72. | Syrtis, quicksands of the Great, 536. | Testament, the New, the standard of the Christian faith, 639. Its relation to the Old, 639. Its language, Greek, 639, 700. |
| Sosthenes, ruler of the Synagogue at Corinth, 491. | | —, Canon of the, history of the, 700. Contents and arrangement of the, 700. Historical Books of the, 700. |
| Sower, parable of the, 268. | | Thaddæus (see Jude). |
| Spain, Paul's project of a visit to, 596. Tradition of Paul's journey to, 622, 623. | | Thaliarchus, the, at the marriage feast at Cana, 218. |
| Star, appearance of the, at Christ's advent, 187, 188. | | Thasos, gold-mines of, 465. |
| Stephanas, baptism of, 488. With others, carries the Epistle to the Corinthians, 512, 513. | | Theologus, title of, 662. |
| Stephen, the martyr, similarity of his words to those of Christ, 334. Made a deacon, 390. His faith and miracles, 391. His success in the controversy with the Hellenistic Jews, 391. His defense before the Sanhedrim, 391, 392. His martyrdom, 393. Scene of the, 393. Its effect on St. Paul, 394. Date of, 395, 396. | | Theophilus, made high-priest, 100. |
| —, St., one of the Seven Deacons, 690. | | —, the, to whom the Gospel of St. Luke is addressed, 706. |
| Stoa Basilica, the, of the Temple, 15. | | Thessalonian Church, restlessness in the, 473. |
| Stoics, Paul encountered by the, 476. | | Thessalonians, First Epistle to the, written at Corinth, 483. |
| Straight, the street called, 413, 417. | | —, Second Epistle to the, written at Corinth, 489. |
| Straton, tower of, site of, 83. | | —, the two Epistles to the, 472. |
| Struthius, the pool, 131. | | Thessalonica, Roman capital of Macedonia, Paul at, 471. Synagogue of the Jews at, 471. |
| "Sufferings of Christ," prediction of the, 277, 278. | | Theudas, revolt of, 888. |
| Supper, the Last, 314-318. Its connection with the Passover, 341, 342. | | Thieves, the two, led with Jesus to death, 830. Their conduct on the cross, 832. |
| —, the Lord's, Christ's institution of, 318. Institution of, not mentioned by St. John, 315. Irregularities in the celebration of, at Corinth, 516. Its celebration in the Primitive Church, 883, 884. | | Thomas, a missionary from the Nestorians, 663. |
| —, the Paschal, account of, 341-343. Its connection with the Last Supper of our Lord, 342. Date of the, 315. | | —, with the assembled Apostles at the second appearance of Jesus to them, 853. His recognition of the Lord's resurrection as a proof of his divinity, 853, 854. Is present at Christ's third appearance to the Apostles, 854. |
| Susanna, 268. | | —, St., the Apostle, 681. His character, 681, 682. |
| Sychar, Christ's disciples at, 226. (See Shechem.) | | |
| Synagogue at Nazareth, Christ's teaching in the, 190. | | |
| —, New, office of, 20. | | |

| THOMAS. | VARUS. | ZOROASTER. |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Traditions concerning him, 632, 633.</p> <p>"Thomas, St., Christians of," 682.</p> <p>Thorns, the crown of, 323.</p> <p>Thrace, heathen worship in, 467.</p> <p>Three Taverns, the, Christians meet Paul at, 531.</p> <p>Thyatira, city of, 466.</p> <p>Tiberias, city of, founded, 105. Sea of (<i>see</i> Galilee).</p> <p>Tiberius, accession of, 107. Death of, 109. Position of the Christian Church at the death of, 399.</p> <p>Tigellinus, 505.</p> <p>Tigranes, 66.</p> <p>Timon, one of the seven deacons, 350, 691.</p> <p>Timotheus, defeated by Judas Maccabeus, 37.</p> <p>—, goes to Troas, 536.</p> <p>Timothy, companion of St. Paul on his second missionary journey, 459. His parentage and youth, 460, 461. St. Paul's appeal to him, 461. His ordination and circumcision, 461. Goes forth with Paul and Silas, 462. Left at Philippi, 470. Left at Beroea, 474. Rejoins Paul at Corinth, 481, 484. His arrival gives a new impulse to St. Paul, 486. His aid owned by Paul, 487. With Paul on his third missionary journey, 501. His mission to Macedonia and Achaia, 507, 508. Rejoins Paul at Philippi, 523. His mission, 523-525. Joins Paul in his imprisonment at Rome, 535. Left as Paul's representative at Ephesus, 611, 612. His last relations with St. Paul, 629. Life of, 696-698. His martyrdom, 698.</p> <p>—, First Epistle to, 608, 610, 612-618.</p> <p>—, Second Epistle to, 678, 617, 618. Its evidence as to the last stage of the Apostle's course, 628. Date of, 626.</p> <p>Titus, sent against the Jews, 126. Besieges Jerusalem, 129-134.</p> <p>—, accompanies Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, 450. With Paul on his third missionary journey, 501. Paul's disappointment at not meeting, at Troas, 521. His arrival at Philippi, 522. His mission, 523, 524. Bearer of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 525. Left as Paul's representative at Crete, 611.</p> | <p>Titus, Epistle to, 608, 610, 617. —, life of, 692-696.</p> <p>Tobit, Book of, 155.</p> <p>Tomb, the three days in the, 349.</p> <p>Tombs of the Prophets, the, 339.</p> <p>Tongues, cloven, of fire, descent of the, 381. Gift of, at the conversion of Cornelius, 428. The disciples speak with, 381. Effect on the people, 382.</p> <p>Trachonitis, under Herod, 81.</p> <p>Trajan, father of the emperor, 127.</p> <p>Transfiguration, the, 278. Scene of, 278, 286, 287.</p> <p>Trinity, Three Persons of the, revealed by Christ in their working for man's redemption, 223.</p> <p>Tripoli (<i>see</i> Berenice).</p> <p>Troas, Alexandria, St. Paul sees at, the vision which calls him to Europe, 463, 464, 465. St. Paul's labors at, 521, 522.</p> <p>—, Paul spends a week at, 536.</p> <p>Trophimus, goes to Troas, 536. Whether with Titus at Corinth, 525.</p> <p>Tryphon, claims the throne for Antiochus, 45. Kills Jonathan, 46. Usurpation of, 47, 48, 49.</p> <p>Tychicus, goes to Troas, 536. Companion of Paul in his imprisonment at Rome, 536. Bearer of the Epistle to the Colossians, 590. His mission to the Colossians and Ephesians, 592.</p> <p>Tyrannus, the school of, Paul preaches in the, 505.</p> <p>Tyre, Paul at, 538.</p> | <p>Vell of the Temple, reading of the, 334.</p> <p>Ventidius, legate of Anthony, 72.</p> <p>Vespasian, conducts the war against the Jews, 126. Reduces Galilee, 137. Maue emperor, 127.</p> <p>Vespasianus, T. Flavius (<i>see</i> Vespasian).</p> <p>Vinegar, the, offered to Christ, 321.</p> <p>Viri Galliei, 840.</p> <p>Vitellius sends Pilate to Rome, 109. Visits Jerusalem, 109.</p> <p>Volumnius, Roman governor of Syria, 83.</p> |
| | | W. |
| | | <p>Water, Living, Christ the, 291.</p> <p>Wedding garment, Parable of the, 306.</p> <p>"Weeks, Feast of" (<i>see</i> Pentecost).</p> <p>Well, Jacob's, Christ at, 225. Site of, 225.</p> <p>Whitsunday (<i>see</i> Pentecost, Day of).</p> <p>Wicked husbandman, Parable of the, 308.</p> <p>Widow, mites of the, 311.</p> <p>Will, freedom of the, belief of the Sadducees in the, 170, 171.</p> <p>Word, St. John's doctrine of the, 179.</p> |
| | | Z. |
| | | <p>Zaccheus, conversion of, 100.</p> <p>Zacharias, priest in the Temple, 179. Gabriel appears to him, 180. His dumbness, 180. Recovers his speech, 182.</p> <p>Zadoc, name of, 169.</p> <p>Zadok, 178. Founder of the Sadducees, 20.</p> <p>Zadokites (<i>see</i> Sadducees).</p> <p>Zealots or fanatics in Jerusalem, 137, 138. Their resistance to the Romans, 124. Received in Cyrene, 147. The, 174. Simon, belonging to the faction of the, 675.</p> <p>Zebedee, cared for by his sons, 235.</p> <p>Zechariah, his prophecy concerning the advent of the Messiah, 804. Prophecy of, concerning the thirty pieces of silver, 823.</p> <p>Zenas, the lawyer, 619.</p> <p>Zion, Mount, Sanctuary on, 50.</p> <p>Zoroaster, religion of, its hope of a great deliverer, 187.</p> |
| | U. | |
| | <p>Um Keis, ruins of, 260. Inhabitants of, 260.</p> <p>Uncircumcision, the Gospel of the, 450.</p> <p>Urbanus, 143.</p> | |
| | V. | |
| | <p>Valerius Flaccus, procurator of Judaea, his conduct toward the Jews in Alexandria, 111. Put to death, 112.</p> <p>—, Gratus, procurator of Judaea, 107.</p> <p>Varus, prefect of Syria, interferes between Sabinus and the Jews, 101. Roman governor of Syria, 82.</p> | |

VALUABLE AND INTERESTING WORKS
FOR
PUBLIC & PRIVATE LIBRARIES,

PUBLISHED BY HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

 For a full List of Books suitable for Libraries published by HARPER & BROTHERS, see HARPER'S CATALOGUE, which may be had gratuitously on application to the publishers personally, or by letter enclosing Nine Cents in postage stamps.

 HARPER & BROTHERS will send their publications by mail, postage prepaid, on receipt of the price.

MACAULAY'S ENGLAND. The History of England from the Accession of James II. By THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY. New Edition, from New Electrotypes Plates. 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, 5 vols., in a Box, \$10 00 per set. Sold only in Sets. Cheap Edition, 5 vols., in a Box, 12mo, Cloth, \$2 50; Sheep, \$3 75.

MACAULAY'S MISCELLANEOUS WORKS. The Miscellaneous Works of Lord Macaulay. From New Electrotypes Plates. In Five Volumes. 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, in a Box, \$10 00. Sold only in Sets.

HUME'S ENGLAND. History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the Abdication of James II., 1688. By DAVID HUME. New and Elegant Library Edition, from New Electrotypes Plates. 6 vols., in a Box, 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$12 00. Sold only in Sets. Popular Edition, 6 vols., in a Box, 12mo, Cloth, \$3 00; Sheep, \$4 50.

GIBBON'S ROME. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. By EDWARD GIBBON. With Notes by Dean MILMAN, M. GUIZOT, and Dr. WILLIAM SMITH. New Edition, from New Electrotypes Plates. 6 vols., 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$12 00. Sold only in Sets. Popular Edition, 6 vols., in a Box, 12mo, Cloth, \$3 00; Sheep, \$4 50.

HILDRETH'S UNITED STATES. History of the United States. **FIRST SERIES:** From the Discovery of the Continent to the Organization of the Government under the Federal Constitution. **SECOND SERIES:** From the Adoption of the Federal Constitution to the End of the Sixteenth Congress. By RICHARD HILDRETH. Popular Edition, 6 vols., in a Box, 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$12 00. Sold only in Sets.

MOTLEY'S DUTCH REPUBLIC. The Rise of the Dutch Republic. A History. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, LL.D., D.C.L. With a Portrait of William of Orange. Cheap Edition, 3 vols., in a Box, 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$6 00. Sold only in Sets. Original Library Edition, 3 vols., 8vo, Cloth, \$10 50; Sheep, \$12 00; Half Calf, \$17 25.

MOTLEY'S UNITED NETHERLANDS. History of the United Netherlands: From the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce—1584–1609. With a full View of the English-Dutch Struggle against Spain, and of the Origin and Destruction of the Spanish Armada. By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, LL.D., D.C.L. Portraits. Cheap Edition, 4 vols., in a Box, 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$8 00. Sold only in Sets. Original Library Edition, 4 volumes, 8vo, Cloth, \$14 00; Sheep, \$16 00; Half Calf, \$23 00.

MOTLEY'S JOHN OF BARNEVELD. The Life and Death of John of Barneveld, Advocate of Holland. With a View of the Primary Causes and Movements of the "Thirty Years' War." By JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, LL.D., D.C.L. Illustrated. Cheap Edition, 2 vols., in a Box, 8vo, Cloth, with Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$4 00. Sold only in Sets. Original Library Edition, 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, \$7 00; Sheep, \$8 00; Half Calf, \$11 50.

GOLDSMITH'S WORKS. The Works of Oliver Goldsmith. Edited by PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A. From New Electrotypes Plates. 4 vols., 8vo, Cloth, Paper Labels, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$8 00. Uniform with the New Library Editions of Macaulay, Hume, Gibbon, Motley, and Hildreth.

GEDDES'S JOHN DE WITT. History of the Administration of John De Witt, Grand Pensionary of Holland. By JAMES GEDDES. Vol. I.—1623–1654. With a Portrait. 8vo, Cloth, \$2 50.

HUDSON'S HISTORY OF JOURNALISM. Journalism in the United States, from 1690 to 1872. By FREDERIC HUDSON. 8vo, Cloth, \$5 00; Half Calf, \$7 25.

SYMONDS'S SKETCHES AND STUDIES IN SOUTHERN EUROPE. By JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS. In Two Volumes. Post 8vo, Cloth, \$4 00.

SYMONDS'S GREEK POETS. Studies of the Greek Poets. By JOHN ADDINGTON SYMONDS. 2 vols., Square 16mo, Cloth, \$8 50.

TREVELYAN'S LIFE OF MACAULAY. The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay. By his Nephew, G. OTTO TREVELYAN, M.P. With Portrait on Steel. Complete in 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$5 00; Sheep, \$6 00; Half Calf, \$9 50. Popular Edition, 2 vols. in one, 12mo, Cloth, \$1 75.

TREVELYAN'S LIFE OF FOX. The Early History of Charles James Fox. By GEORGE OTTO TREVELYAN. 8vo, Cloth, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$2 50; 4to, Paper, 20 cents.

MÜLLER'S POLITICAL HISTORY OF RECENT TIMES. Political History of Recent Times (1816-1875). With Special Reference to Germany. By WILLIAM MÜLLER. Revised and Enlarged by the Author. Translated, with an Appendix covering the Period from 1876 to 1881, by the Rev. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D. 12mo, Cloth, \$3 00.

LOSSING'S CYCLOPÆDIA OF UNITED STATES HISTORY. Popular Cyclopædia of United States History. From the Aboriginal Period to 1876. By B. J. LOSSING, LL.D. Illustrated by 2 Steel Portraits and over 1000 Engravings. 2 vols., Royal 8vo, Cloth, \$10 00. (*Sold by Subscription only.*)

LOSSING'S FIELD-BOOK OF THE REVOLUTION. Pictorial Field-Book of the Revolution; or, Illustrations by Pen and Pencil of the History, Biography, Scenery, Relics, and Traditions of the War for Independence. By BENSON J. LOSSING. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, \$14 00; Sheep or Roan, \$15 00; Half Calf, \$18 00.

LOSSING'S FIELD-BOOK OF THE WAR OF 1812. Pictorial Field-Book of the War of 1812; or, Illustrations by Pen and Pencil of the History, Biography, Scenery, Relics, and Traditions of the last War for American Independence. By BENSON J. LOSSING. With several hundred Engravings on Wood by Lossing and Barritt, chiefly from Original Sketches by the Author. 1088 pages, 8vo, Cloth, \$7 00; Sheep, \$8 50; Roan, \$9 00; Half Calf, \$10 00.

PARTON'S CARICATURE. Caricature and Other Comic Art, in All Times and Many Lands. By JAMES PARTON. 203 Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$5 00; Half Calf, \$7 25.

MAHAFFY'S GREEK LITERATURE. A History of Classical Greek Literature. By J. P. MAHAFFY. 2 vols., 12mo, Cloth, \$4 00; Half Calf, \$7 50.

DU CHAILLU'S LAND OF THE MIDNIGHT SUN. Summer and Winter Journeys in Sweden, Norway, and Lapland, and Northern Finland. By PAUL B. DU CHAILLU. Illustrated. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, \$7 50.

DU CHAILLU'S EQUATORIAL AFRICA. Explorations and Adventures in Equatorial Africa: with Accounts of the Manners and Customs of the People, and of the Chase of the Gorilla, Crocodile, Leopard, Elephant, Hippopotamus, and other Animals. By P. B. DU CHAILLU. Illustrated. 8vo, Cloth, \$5 00; Sheep, \$5 50; Half Calf, \$7 25.

DU CHAILLU'S ASHANGO LAND. A Journey to Ashango Land, and Further Penetration into Equatorial Africa. By P. B. DU CHAILLU. Illustrated. 8vo, Cloth, \$5 00; Sheep, \$5 50; Half Calf, \$7 25.

DEXTER'S CONGREGATIONALISM. The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, as Seen in its Literature: with Special Reference to certain Recondite, Neglected, or Disputed Passages. With a Bibliographical Appendix. By H. M. DEXTER. Large 8vo, Cloth, \$6 00.

STANLEY'S THROUGH THE DARK CONTINENT. Through the Dark Continent; or, The Sources of the Nile, Around the Great Lakes of Equatorial Africa, and Down the Livingstone River to the Atlantic Ocean. 149 Illustrations and 10 Maps. By H. M. STANLEY. 2 vols., 8vo, Cloth, \$10 00; Sheep, \$12 00; Half Morocco, \$15 00.

BARTLETT'S FROM EGYPT TO PALESTINE. From Egypt to Palestine: Through Sinai, the Wilderness, and the South Country. Observations of a Journey made with Special Reference to the History of the Israelites. By S. C. BARTLETT, D.D., LL.D. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo, Cloth, \$3 50.

FORSTER'S LIFE OF DEAN SWIFT. The Early Life of Jonathan Swift (1667-1711). By JOHN FORSTER. With Portrait. 8vo, Cloth, Uncut Edges and Gilt Tops, \$2 50.

GREEN'S ENGLISH PEOPLE. History of the English People. By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A. Four Volumes. With Maps. 8vo, Cloth, \$2 50 per volume.

GREEN'S MAKING OF ENGLAND. The Making of England. By J. R. GREEN. With Maps. 8vo, Cloth, \$2 50.